

> Contents

> Foreword

> Imprint

# Social and Economic Conditions of Student Life in Europe



**EUROSTUDENT V 2012–2015 | Synopsis of Indicators**

**DZHW**  
Deutsches Zentrum für  
Hochschul- und Wissenschaftsforschung

**eurostudent.eu**  
★★★★

SPONSORED BY THE



Federal Ministry  
of Education  
and Research



Ministry of Education, Culture  
and Science of the Netherlands



Co-funded by the  
Lifelong Learning Programme  
of the European Union



## **Social and Economic Conditions of Student Life in Europe**



Kristina Hauschildt, Christoph Gwosć, Nicolai Netz, Shweta Mishra

# Social and Economic Conditions of Student Life in Europe

Synopsis of Indicators | EUROSTUDENT V 2012–2015

**DZHW**  
Deutsches Zentrum für  
Hochschul- und Wissenschaftsforschung


**eurostudent.eu**  
★★★★



This publication is available as a free download on [wbv-open-access.de](http://wbv-open-access.de).

This publication has been published as the following Creative Commons Licence:

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>



Names of goods, company names and brand names used in this publication may be protected by property rights even if these rights have not been explicitly specified. The fact that names of goods, company names and brand names are used in this publication does not entitle to assume that these names can be used freely.

#### **Editor**

Kristina Hauschildt  
(Deutsches Zentrum für Hochschul-  
und Wissenschaftsforschung)

#### **Authors**

Kristina Hauschildt  
Christoph Gwosć  
Nicolai Netz  
Shweta Mishra

#### **Project coordinators**

Dominic Orr  
Kristina Hauschildt  
Christoph Gwosć  
Nicolai Netz  
Shweta Mishra  
Matthias Liedtke  
Viktor Dick

E-mail: [eurostudent@dzhw.eu](mailto:eurostudent@dzhw.eu)  
[www.eurostudent.eu](http://www.eurostudent.eu)

#### **Publishing House**

W. Bertelsmann Verlag GmbH & Co. KG  
P.O. Box 10 06 33, 33506 Bielefeld  
Phone: (+49-5 21) 9 11 01-11  
Fax: (+49-5 21) 9 11 01-19  
E-mail: [service@wbv.de](mailto:service@wbv.de)  
[www.wbv.de](http://www.wbv.de)

#### **Design**

Marion Schnepf, [www.lokbases.com](http://www.lokbases.com)  
© W. Bertelsmann Verlag  
GmbH & Co. KG, Bielefeld 2015

Printed in Germany  
Order no.: 6001920b  
ISBN: 978-3-7639-5521-3 (Print)  
DOI: 10.3278/6001920bw

The authors and the publisher have thoroughly checked the accuracy of the information presented in this publication. However, mistakes cannot be ruled out completely. Some information might have changed since print production. The aforementioned parties, therefore, do not assume liability for the accuracy and completeness of the information presented here.

---

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek:

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie. Detailed bibliographic data are available at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

## Project sponsors



Lifelong  
Learning  
Programme

This project has been co-funded with support from the European Commission.  
This publication reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.



Federal Ministry  
of Education  
and Research

This project was commissioned and supported with funds by the Federal Ministry of Education and Research (Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung, BMBF, grant agreement no. M 1672.03)



Ministry of Education, Culture  
and Science of the Netherlands

This project was commissioned and supported with funds by the Dutch Ministry of Education, Culture and Science (MinOCW).

## Members of the project consortium



Deutsches Zentrum für  
Hochschul- und Wissenschaftsforschung

Deutsches Zentrum für Hochschul- und Wissenschaftsforschung (DZHW), Germany  
*Dominic Orr, Christoph Gwosć, Kristina Hauschildt, Matthias Liedtke, Shweta Mishra, Nicolai Netz*



Institute for Advanced Studies (IHS), Austria  
*Martin Unger, Jakob Hartl, Petra Wejwar*



Praxis Centre for Policy Studies (Praxis), Estonia  
*Hanna-Stella Haaristo*



European Council for Student Affairs (ECStA), Belgium  
*Sven Engel, Danja Oste*



www.researchned.nl

ResearchNed, The Netherlands  
*Froukje Wartenbergh-Cras, Bas Kurver*



National Commission for  
Further and  
Higher Education  
Malta

National Commission for Further and Higher Education (NCFHE), Malta  
*Christine Scholz*



Schweizerische Eidgenossenschaft  
Confédération suisse  
Confederazione Svizzera  
Confederaziun svizra

Swiss Confederation

Federal Department of Home Affairs FDHA  
Federal Statistical Office FSO

Federal Statistical Office (FSO), Switzerland  
*Sarah Gerhard Ortega, Frank Schubert, Philipp Fischer*

## Country abbreviations

In all figures, the following abbreviations are used to refer to the participating countries.

AM	Armenia	LT	Lithuania
AT	Austria	LV	Latvia
BA	Bosnia and Herzegovina	ME	Montenegro
CH	Switzerland	MT	Malta
CZ	Czech Republic	NL	The Netherlands
DE	Germany	NO	Norway
DK	Denmark	PL	Poland
EE	Estonia	RO	Romania
FI	Finland	RS	Serbia
FR	France	RU	Russia
HR	Croatia	SE	Sweden
HU	Hungary	SI	Slovenia
GE	Georgia	SK	Slovakia
IE	Ireland	UA	Ukraine
IT	Italy		

# Contents

<b>Forewords</b> .....	9
<b>1. Introduction</b> .....	13
<b>2. Transition into higher education</b> .....	27
<b>3. Social background of national student populations</b> .....	45
<b>4. Characteristics of national student populations</b> .....	59
<b>5. Types and modes of study</b> .....	73
<b>6. Employment and time budget</b> .....	95
<b>7. Students' resources</b> .....	117
<b>8. Students' expenses</b> .....	143
<b>9. Housing situation</b> .....	165
<b>10. Mobility and internationalisation</b> .....	185
<b>11. Students' assessment of their studies and future plans</b> .....	209
<b>12. Executive summary</b> .....	231
 <b>References</b> .....	 243
<b>Appendix A – National contributors</b> .....	249
<b>Appendix B – Metadata on national surveys</b> .....	255
<b>Appendix C – Key data on national student populations (weighted, in %) ..</b>	<b>257</b>
<b>Appendix D – Raw data on national samples (unweighted, in %)</b> .....	<b>259</b>





## Forewords

Making education accessible to all is the cornerstone for inclusive economic growth and a healthy society. Higher education has a particular part to play in this as it prepares our citizens for highly skilled jobs in the knowledge economy. It is for this reason that I support the work of the EUROSTUDENT project. This report assesses how accessible higher education is to different groups of students, particularly those who are frequently underrepresented. It also looks at the social and economic conditions of studying in the twenty-first century. Each new generation of students studies differently, with different goals and expectations, and with the huge expansion in higher education participation across Europe has come an increasingly diverse student body. Understanding the characteristics of students and how they combine studying with their daily life is key to assessing the fairness and effectiveness of a country's higher education system.

One of the focal points of the Italian Presidency of the Council of the European Union has been the contribution of education to economic growth and the interrelationship between education and employment. The report you have in front of you highlights these links in three important ways. It shows, firstly, that many countries are widening access to student groups which are traditionally underrepresented such as those from low socio-economic background. It becomes evident that many of these new students bring work experience with them into their university and college seminars. It is therefore now up to universities and colleges to make use of this experience to create a stronger link between business experience and educational development.

The report shows, secondly, that a large share of students work alongside their studies. Asked about their motivations, most students state that the main reason for working is to improve their living standard, but more than one in two working students state that they are working to gain work experience and two in every five working actually finds a job closely related to their subject of study. Again, this presents new opportunities for a closer nexus between studies and the labour market and it would surely be good to see this opportunity being exploited through the open learning practices associated with student-centred learning.

Thirdly, a global, interconnected world requires global, interconnected graduates of higher education. The study looks into the temporary international mobility of students during their studies on programmes like Erasmus. Unfortunately the study points out that studying abroad remains socially selective. However, by looking more closely at the obstacles to mobility it finds that there are financial barriers, but also attitudinal and informational barriers. Therefore, as we tried to promote with the concept of "curricular Erasmus", an enhancement of financial schemes should go hand in hand with better information on the availability of support and on the benefits of going abroad.

The increased integration of European higher education brought by the Bologna Process facilitates the provision of these additional support factors and the present study shows that, in most countries, more than two-thirds of students who gained credits for their studies abroad were able to get these fully or partially recognised at home.

In 2014 the EUROSTUDENT project celebrates two decades of existence since colleagues from Austria, France, Germany and Italy first got together in a pilot study. In this fifth wave of the project harmonised data from 29 European countries, stretching well beyond the boundaries of the European Union and including many non-EU members of the European Higher Education Area, is compared and contrasted. The cooperative work necessary to make this happen makes this project a role model for the type of exchange and cooperation between countries we have emphasised during the Italian presidency.

I wish the project every success for the future and other readers of the report a few new insights which might give you cause to contemplate how to improve higher education's contribution to an innovative and inclusive society.



Stefania Giannini

Minister of Education, Universities and Research, Italy

This publication – EUROSTUDENT V Synopsis of Indicators – represents a comprehensive comparative analysis of study conditions and role of the social and economic characteristics of students in European higher education. The study, the 5th edition, covers 30 countries in the European Higher Education Area out of 47 countries which participate in the Bologna Process. Its previous issue involved 24 countries. It is worth remarking that its first publication, produced in 2000, included data from only 8 countries. Such an increase is a good indicator of the relevance of provided analysis for participating countries, based on solidity of the methodological approach in collection, presentation and interpretation of data. It also bears witness to the fact that the “social dimension” of higher education is being recognized not only as relevant to individual students, but constitutes an integral feature of fostering societal cohesion and prosperity at the national and European level. Such increased attention to the social dimension is in line with the stipulations of consecutive ministerial communiqués of the Bologna Process (London 2007, Leuven 2009, Budapest-Vienna 2010, and Bucharest 2012).

Like previous issues, the 5th round of EUROSTUDENT lasted approximately three years, reflecting developments in the period 2012–2015. It is a period during which European higher education has been subjected, in a prevailing number of countries of the region, to adaptation to difficult economic conditions. Furthermore, financial difficulties have led to lowering of public budgets in support of students. Such trends are particularly worrisome taking into consideration the importance of public funding in European higher education.

The Synopsis of Indicators provides a wide range of data reflecting the social dimension of student conditions, such as: access to higher education and organization of studies, study conditions, as well as international mobility and future plans. Taking into consideration the current concern with the results of higher education studies and the employability of graduates, the latter topic merits a closer look. The analysis covers such issues as: assessment of student chances on the national labour market by field of study and on the national versus the international labour market, plans for continuation of studies in general as well as for studies abroad. It is reassuring to see that overall the satisfaction of students with their current study programmes is quite high, in particular with regard to the quality of teaching and the study facilities. Taking into consideration the current level of unemployment among graduates, which is persistently high in a number of countries in the European region, it is as heartening as it is surprising to see optimism about employment prospects on the national labour market, with the exception of the apparent scepticism of students of humanities and arts.

With one of the strategic objectives of the Bologna Process being student mobility, it is important to learn from the presented analysis that students are generally willing to take up the opportunity offered by the variety of regional, national and institutional mobility programmes, even if reaping the benefits from them is unequally distributed across countries and social groups. The latter condition appears to be of significance for explaining lack of participative equity among the student population, in particular among those attending universities in comparison to students attending non-university institutions.

The study confirms that despite noticeable differences between European countries concerning access, social conditions, student life and mobility, the student body of the region has undergone changes similar to those in other regions of the world. The most prevailing one being the consequences of expansion of higher education (massification) combined with an increased diversification of the student body by social background and age. In some countries of the region those trends are combined with rapid demographic decline in the size of the traditional secondary school-leaver population, from which the student population has traditionally been constituted.

EUROSTUDENT V is an important empirical source for policy analysis at the national and international levels. It represents also a good example of international comparative research on higher education. In such a context, assuring the comparability of data collected is an additional challenge.

Anyone who has participated in this kind of study will readily affirm that implementation of such a complex project like EUROSTUDENT V required a combination of political sensitivity and academic diplomacy, teamwork and advanced understanding of the heterogeneity of social policies within the European region. The above-mentioned competencies and qualities were clearly met by the members of the EUROSTUDENT Consortium, which as in previous survey rounds has been ably coordinated by Dominic Orr.

*Dr. Jan Sadlak*

Paris

# Chapter 1

## Introduction

### Context of the Synopsis: Monitoring the social dimension of higher education in Europe


Since the first round of the EUROSTUDENT project in 1994, the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) has been facing an ongoing process of change. In order to further press forward these changes, the Ministers responsible for higher education in the 47 countries of the EHEA have, in recent years, put their utmost efforts into consolidating the EHEA. In this, they are following the goals of providing quality higher education for all, enhancing graduates' employability and strengthening mobility as a means for better learning and adopting national measures for widening overall access to quality higher education, as announced in the Bucharest Communiqué (2012). The most recent economic and financial crisis which hit Europe in the last decade has strongly affected students' lives in Europe. As a consequence, the Ministers view '(h)igher education as an important part of the solution to our current difficulties [...] to overcome the crisis [...] and to secure the highest possible level of public funding for higher education and drawing on other sources, as an investment in our future' (Bucharest Communiqué, 2012). By resolving to 'step[ping] up our [the Ministers'] efforts toward underrepresented groups to develop the social dimension of higher education, reduce inequalities and provide adequate student support services, counselling and guidance, flexible learning paths and alternative access routes, including recognition of prior learning' (Bucharest Communiqué, 2012), additional emphasis has been placed on the importance the Ministers place on the social dimension in higher education and the goal that 'the student body entering and graduating from higher education institutions should reflect the diversity of Europe's population'.

In the Bucharest Communiqué (2012), the EUROSTUDENT Network, Eurostat, and Eurydice were assigned to 'monitor the progress in the implementation of the Bologna Process reforms'. As a result of the collaboration between EUROSTUDENT, Eurydice, Eurostat, and the European Commission, the *European Higher Education Area 2012: Bologna Process Implementation Report* was published. This publication depicted the state of the Bologna process in the 47 EHEA countries in 2012 and focused on the six topic areas degrees and qualifications, quality assurance, social dimension, effective outcomes and employability, lifelong learning, and mobility. EUROSTUDENT also contributes to the upcoming (2015) Bologna Process Implementation Report.

The present Synopsis of Indicators presents the findings of the 5<sup>th</sup> round of the EUROSTUDENT project, to which 30 countries of the EHEA have contributed between 2012–2015. It is a collection of key indicators on the social dimension of higher education in 29 countries and functions to monitor progress in the implementation of the Bologna Process reforms (Bucharest Communiqué, 2012).

With the EUROSTUDENT V Synopsis of Indicators, the authors hope to contribute to the ongoing process of establishing a European-wide monitoring infrastructure on the

Figure 1.1

**The EUROSTUDENT Network – Overview of contributors and observers**

social dimension of higher education and to support evidence-based policy on national and European levels.

### The EUROSTUDENT Network

EUROSTUDENT is a network of researchers and data collectors, representatives of national ministries and other stakeholders working together to examine the social and economic conditions of student life in higher education systems in Europe. In the 5<sup>th</sup> round of EUROSTUDENT, 30 countries were active contributors to the EUROSTUDENT Network and two countries had an observer status. The EUROSTUDENT project's geographic span reaches from Norway in the north to Malta in the south and from Portugal in the west to Russia in the east. This means that the EUROSTUDENT project now covers most of larger Europe, providing data based on surveys of more than 210,000 students.


Figure 1.1 gives an overview of the EUROSTUDENT contributors and observing countries. More information on the contributing network members can be found in [Appendix A](#).

The 5<sup>th</sup> round of EUROSTUDENT lasted from April 2012 – May 2015 and was funded through contracts with ministries responsible for higher education in the EUROSTUDENT countries. The country participation fee was co-funded by the European Commission under the Lifelong Learning Programme. The project also received additional financial support from the German Federal Ministry for Education and Research and the Dutch Ministry for Education, Culture and Science.

The EUROSTUDENT Network combines a central coordination approach with the principle of shared responsibility. The central coordination is directed by the Deutsches Zentrum für Hochschul- und Wissenschaftsforschung (DZHW) which is based in Hanover, Germany. In its function as central coordinator, DZHW heads the EUROSTUDENT Consortium consisting of seven international partners: the Institute for Advanced Studies (IHS, Austria), Praxis Centre for Policy Studies (Praxis, Estonia), the

Figure 1.2

## Organisation of responsibilities within the EUROSTUDENT Network



European Council on Student Affairs (ECStA, Belgium), ResearchNed (The Netherlands), the Maltese National Commission for Further and Higher Education (NCFHE, Malta), and the Swiss Federal Statistical Office (FSO, Switzerland).

The network character of the project brings together the knowledge of experts from different countries. This assures that the design of the project is suitable for international comparative analyses and that country-specific context information is taken into account. This information is indispensable for a balanced interpretation of data from such a large and diverse group of countries. Each partner has its own responsibilities within the EUROSTUDENT Network. The work of the EUROSTUDENT Consortium is supported by an international Steering Board (Figure 1.2). The Steering Board guides the EUROSTUDENT Consortium in the development of a reliable, contextually sensitive and policy relevant comparative study of the social dimension of European higher education. The members of the Steering Board are the European Commission (EC), the Bologna Follow-Up Group (BFUG), the European Students' Union (ESU), the German Federal Ministry for Education and Research (BMBF), the Dutch Ministry of Education, Culture and Science (MinOCW), the Observatoire de la vie étudiante (OVE), the Danish Ministry of Higher Education and Science (UDS), and the Croatian Ministry of Science, Education and Sports (MZOS). It is thus comprised of three stakeholder organisations (European Commission, BFUG and ESU), and five members from national ministries who represent all EUROSTUDENT countries.

The implementation and analysis of the national student surveys lies within the area of responsibility of the contributing countries. Throughout the project, the central coordinators and the EUROSTUDENT Consortium work closely with the EUROSTUDENT countries to assure a common understanding of and compliance with data conventions. Once the data are delivered by the national contributors, they are reviewed by the central coordinators through a series of feedback loops. The national teams conduct a final check of the data for plausibility before the results are published in the comparative report.



## Box 1.1

## Focus groups names and symbols

Name of variable	Values	Further explanation
Educational background	▲ with HE background ▼ without HE background	<p><b>Students with higher education background</b> have parents of which at least one has attained a higher education degree (ISCED 1997 level 5–6). In terms of ISCED 2011, this means that at least one of these students' parents has successfully completed a short cycle tertiary degree (level 5), a Bachelor's (level 6) or Master's degree (level 7), or a doctorate (level 8) or their national equivalent.</p> <p><b>Students without higher education background</b> have parents whose highest educational degree is no higher than ISCED 1997/2011 level 4 (post-secondary non-tertiary education).</p> <p>(&gt;Box 3.1)</p>
Type of higher education institution	■ university ■ non-university	<p><b>University students</b> study at a higher education institution offering those programmes/degrees which are in the focus of the EUROSTUDENT standard target group (Box 1.2).</p> <p><b>Non-university students</b> study at an institution which is not a university, but is offering higher education programmes/degrees for the EUROSTUDENT standard target group. Non-universities are for instance Universities of Applied Sciences/Polytechnics and similar higher education institutions.</p>
Type of study programme	● Bachelor ● Master	<p>Within the EUROSTUDENT standard target group, <b>students currently enrolled in a Bachelor degree programme</b> and <b>students currently enrolled in a Master degree programme</b> are two special focus groups.</p>
Field of study	○ humanities □ engineering	<p>This focus group aims at comparing the two fields of study, using international standard classifications (ISCED 2011).</p> <p><b>Humanities:</b> Students studying a subject in the field of "Humanities and Arts"</p> <p><b>Engineering:</b> Students studying a subject in the field of "Engineering, Manufacturing and Construction"</p>
Study intensity	⊕ high intensity ⊖ low intensity	<p>Students are divided into the two categories according to their weekly workload in a typical week for study-related activities (taught courses and personal study time).</p> <p><b>Low intensity students</b> spend between 0 and 20 hours a week on study related activities.</p> <p><b>High intensity students</b> spend more than 40 hours a week on study-related activities.</p>
Transition route	■ delayed transition	<p><b>Delayed transition students</b> have a delay of more than 24 months between leaving the school system for the first time and entering HE for the first time.</p>
Educational origin	international students Focus group was not analyzed in this report but is available in >DRM	<p><b>International students</b> are studying in the country of the survey and have left the school system for the first time outside the country of the survey. That means the status as international student is not related to place of birth, nationality or citizenship.</p>
Dependency on income source	■ dependent on family support ■ dependent on own earnings ■ dependent on public support	<p>A student is considered dependent on an income source if one of the three sources "support from family/partner" (including transfers in kind), "own earnings" or "public support" provides more than 50 % of the student's total income (total income includes transfers in kind). Students with a mixed budget (i.e. no source providing more than 50 % of total income) are not assigned to a group.</p>
Age group	◆ < 22 years ◆ 22–24 years ◆ 25–29 years ◆ 30 years and older	–
Sex	■ male ● female	–

## Data collection conventions and mechanisms

One of the main approaches to assuring quality in the EUROSTUDENT Network is input harmonisation. The central coordination team sets the core set of questions and the target group for the survey which should be applied in each national context. To support the harmonisation of the inputs, every EUROSTUDENT team was asked to take part in one of the four preparatory seminars. These explained the EUROSTUDENT Conventions and the way of working with the coordination team.

EUROSTUDENT Conventions are the instruments used to ensure the comparability and quality of the data collected. Since the first round of EUROSTUDENT, these conventions

## Box 1.2

**The standard target group of EUROSTUDENT V**

Following a survey among administrators, researchers and users of the data, and the discussions at the workshops in Berlin in May 2012, an intensive seminar in Hamburg in June 2012, various discussions within the EUROSTUDENT Consortium and with associated experts, and a final seminar in Vienna in October 2012, the EUROSTUDENT Network has defined a standard target group to be surveyed by all participating countries. An optional target group was also defined, however, this is not covered in the Synopsis of Indicators (>[Data Delivery Handbook](#)).

**Standard target group to be covered by all participating countries** (“minimum”):

- All students in a country, i.e. national and foreign students who are pursuing their studies for a degree in the country of the survey, except students on leave, and excluding students on incoming and outgoing credit mobility.
- Full-time and part-time students by status.
- Students in all ISCED 2011 5, 6 and 7 programmes, regardless of their character as general or professional, as long as the programmes are considered higher education in the national context.
- All higher education institutions offering programmes considered “normal”. In many cases, this means only public, non-specialist institutions of higher education.
- All national degrees corresponding to ISCED 2011 levels 5, 6 and 7 (e.g. BA, MA, traditional diploma, Lizentiat, national degrees in medicine. Short courses only if they are based on ISCED 5).
- Distance students who study at a “normal” higher education institution, i.e. excluding institutions solely for long distance students such as open universities, Fernuniversität Hagen, and similar.

**Optional groups** (not covered in the Synopsis)

- ISCED 8, Doctoral/PhD Students
- Higher education institutions not considered for the standard target group (e.g. specialist institutions).

Within the standard target group, further distinctions between students groups are made (Box 1.1).

have been continuously developed further and are the result of productive discussions during several project meetings, intensive seminars, and workshops which were organised by the EUROSTUDENT Network. They are documented in a number of handbooks that are provided to all EUROSTUDENT partners as well as the interested public.<sup>1</sup> These conventions comprise definitions of the most important constructs used in the national surveys (>[Data Delivery Handbook](#)) and include a core questionnaire with 58 questions that should be embedded into all national surveys (>[Technical Manual for the Execution of the EUROSTUDENT Survey in National Setting](#)). This allows the national

<sup>1</sup> All EUROSTUDENT handbooks can be found on the project website: [http://www.eurostudent.eu/about/docs/index\\_html](http://www.eurostudent.eu/about/docs/index_html)

distributors to deliver data on 147 precisely described subtopics differentiated by 21 focus groups ([Data Delivery Handbook](#)). Box 1.1 provides an overview of focus groups and symbols used throughout the report.

The Manual for Data Cleaning and Data Processing provides instructions on data cleaning and data processing in order to prepare the countries' data for delivery. It also contains an SPSS syntax to further ease the work of the national research teams ([Manual for Data Cleaning and Data Processing](#)). The methodological guidelines for the execution of the national surveys were elaborated during the 5<sup>th</sup> round of EUROSTUDENT ([Instructions for EUROSTUDENT V Questionnaire with Survey Monkey](#)). Besides the core questionnaire, the most important methodological specification concerns the standard target group to be surveyed by the national contributors (Box 1.2). The Instruction on Model Syntax for producing Data Delivery Module (DDM) outputs was released in order to support the countries in preparing the tables they delivered for the DDM. ([Instruction on Model Syntax for producing DDM output](#)).

One major objective of the EUROSTUDENT Conventions is to help countries improve and align their national survey methodologies in order to allow for cross-country comparisons based on the data collected. This will lead to output harmonisation. The second objective is to support researchers in those countries where student surveys have been implemented only in the context of the EUROSTUDENT project.

It is necessary to note that sometimes countries were not able to completely comply with the EUROSTUDENT Conventions. Specifics regarding national samples are explained in Box 1.3. Additional, topic-specific deviations from EUROSTUDENT Conventions are noted beneath each figure/table and explained at the beginning of the respective chapters. Most countries conducted their survey in the spring of 2013. Please see [Appendix B](#) for deviations regarding survey timing.

The EUROSTUDENT countries have used different tools for conducting their national surveys. In order to improve the comparability of the data collected, the national contributors were encouraged to use online surveys. This is one reason why in the 5<sup>th</sup> round of EUROSTUDENT the majority of countries used online surveys as their main survey instrument (Figure 1.3).

**Figure 1.3**

**Main survey instruments used by national contributors**

	Online survey	Paper and pencil	Telephone interview
Countries	AM, AT, CH, CZ, DK, EE, FI, FR, GE, HR, HU, IE, LT, ME, MT, NL, NO, PL, RO, SE, SI	BA, DE, GE, IE, LV, NO, RS, RU, SK, UA	IT
Total	21	10	1

## Box 1.3

**Notes on national samples and deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group**

- **Austria:** The Austrian survey took place in 2011. Since the EUROSTUDENT V core questionnaire was not finished at the time, the Austrian data set does not contain several topics and variables.
- **Czech Republic:** Higher professional schools are not part of the tertiary system in the Czech Republic. The group of delayed transition students contains students from Slovakia who obtained their leaving qualification in the Czech Republic.
- **Bosnia and Herzegovina:** Data do not cover the Republic of Srpska and District Brčko.
- **Finland:** At Finnish universities, a common practice is for a student to be admitted to study for both a bachelor and master level degree. Bachelor students at universities might not have considered master studies as a continuation of studies. Adult students and foreign students were included in Finnish sample for the first time in EUROSTUDENT V. Results are not comparable with the previous rounds of EUROSTUDENT because of these changes in the sample.
- **France:** International students are underrepresented.
- **Georgia:** Georgia has taken part in EUROSTUDENT V in the framework of a pilot exercise with the goal of assessing the feasibility of implementing EUROSTUDENT at the national level. The sample encompasses only public universities and national students. Students from non-university institutions did not participate in the survey. These are *deviations from the EUROSTUDENT standard target group*. Sample universe for this study were all students who are citizens of Georgia and take Bachelor or Master programs in non-specialized public higher education institutions. Based on an existing database, almost 70% of the students study at public higher education institutions. According to the requirement for this study, stratified random sampling was used to obtain data that is representative for general population. Bachelor and Master programme specializations were defined using the National Qualifications Framework (NQF) which was later re-coded according to the ISCED 2011 education classification for analyses.
- **Germany:** Only German students and foreign students who obtained their higher education entrance qualification in Germany are included in the sample. Students with foreign citizenship and a higher education entrance qualification obtained abroad (referred to as “Bildungsausländer” in German) were addressed through a different survey and not part of the delivery to EUROSTUDENT. There are therefore *deviations from the EUROSTUDENT standard target group* and no adequate data to generate the focus group “International students“. Students enrolled in programmes at ISCED 2011 level 5 (Short-cycle tertiary education) are also not included in the German sample as these programmes are typically not considered to be higher education in Germany. According to the definition used for the German national report “Sozialerhebung” – and in line with the national understanding of higher education – the focus group “social background” is defined in the following way: students with higher education background are defined as having at least one parent with a degree attained at university or university of applied sciences (“Universität” or “Fachhochschule”), typically at ISCED 2011 level 6, 7, or 8. Students with parents who attained a degree at a non-academic institution

(Fach-, Meister-, Technikerschule, Berufs- or Fachakademie) are counted as “without higher education background”. However, in chapter 3, German data are analysed according to the EUROSTUDENT Conventions, i.e. according to ISCED 2011 levels. Therefore, students whose parents acquired an educational degree of level 5 or 6 at a non-academic institution are defined as having a higher education background in this chapter.

- **Italy:** All the data refer to university students. No data on international students. These are *deviations from the EUROSTUDENT standard target group*.
- **Kazakhstan:** Kazakhstan has taken part in EUROSTUDENT V in the framework of a pilot exercise with the goal of assessing the feasibility of implementing EUROSTUDENT at the national level. The data are not presented in this report but are expected in the [>DRM](#).
- **Latvia:** Only full-time students were included in the sampling frame.
- **Montenegro:** The EUROSTUDENT sampling frame resulted in a sample that contains only university/faculty students (i.e., no non-university students).
- **Portugal:** The Portuguese data are not presented in this report but are expected in the [>DRM](#).
- **Romania:** In Romania, all higher education institutions are considered to be universities. No international students responded although they were included in the sampling frame. The Romanian data are not weighted. Checks with regard to sex, qualification studied for, study intensity and field of study show that the data reasonably match national statistical data.
- **Russia:** Russia has taken part in EUROSTUDENT V in the framework of a pilot exercise with the goal of assessing the feasibility of implementing EUROSTUDENT at the national level. The data are not weighted.
- **Slovakia:** The sample is made up solely of students who attended public higher education institutions named University. There are 20 public higher education institutions of which only three are non-universities and none of them has more than 1,000 students. Since one of the criteria in creating the survey sample was the total number of students in each higher education institution and the number of respondents was calculated proportionally, the smallest institutions were not involved to the survey. This was the case for all three public non-universities in our country.
- **Slovenia:** International students cannot be identified due to the high number of missing responses on the identifying variable. 90% of data in question 2.1 are missing and no respondent has chosen ‘foreign qualification’. Question 2.2 (country of qualification) is missing in the survey – therefore no respondent can be classified as international.
- **Sweden:** All covered higher education institutions in Sweden were categorized as universities, as no non-universities according to EUROSTUDENT Conventions could be identified. In Sweden applicants to higher education can apply to a programme or to a course, courses are the building blocks of a programme. However, a large number of courses in the higher education system are not within programmes. These courses are called “freestanding courses” and are elective for students who do not want to follow a program but want to choose the content of their education. These students can also study for a degree but they have to apply each semester for a new course. When a student has the right amount of credits in certain fields the student can apply for a certificate in a general qualification.

Since this student group is quite large (1/3 of the FTEs in 2011/2012), respondents who are studying for a degree but have not yet decided what degree they are aiming for, are included in the sample.

- **Ukraine:** Ukraine has taken part in EUROSTUDENT V in the framework of a pilot exercise with the goal of assessing the feasibility of implementing EUROSTUDENT at the national level. The survey was not conducted in Crimea region. The data are not weighted.

The main technical device for the output harmonisation approach is the so-called Data Delivery Module (DDM). The DDM is an online interface which allows countries to input their data into a central database for data analysis and reporting. The DDM uses simple plausibility checks and graphics on-the-fly to prevent contributors from making data entry mistakes. The national teams did not provide the coordinators with micro data, but with aggregate data on 147 predefined subtopics. For each of these subtopics, a precise description of the pertaining indicators and the manner they should be calculated is available so that countries are guided through the data delivery process.

In addition to delivering the necessary indicators, national researchers comment on the data they deliver from a national point-of-view. This, on the one hand, helps the coordination team in interpreting the data, and, on the other, provides orientation to interested researchers and other stakeholders wishing to work with the EUROSTUDENT data themselves. All data provided by the national contributors as well as their commentaries on the data are made available at the end of the project via the so-called Data Reporting Module (DRM), accessible via the EUROSTUDENT website [www.eurostudent.eu](http://www.eurostudent.eu). The DRM is one element of the EUROSTUDENT reporting infrastructure, as will be explained below.

### The Synopsis of Indicators within the EUROSTUDENT reporting infrastructure

The main target groups of the Synopsis are higher education policy-makers at national and European level, researchers in this field, managers of higher education institutions, and students all over Europe. EUROSTUDENT data have been used, for instance, to evaluate policies related to students' time budget, alternative access routes into higher education, promoting international mobility amongst students and tuition fee policies (EUROSTUDENT: Annual Report 2013).<sup>2</sup> The focus on these target groups explains the structure and layout of the Synopsis.

The *Synopsis of Indicators* is the central product of the EUROSTUDENT project and therefore the main deliverable of the EUROSTUDENT V project. It adopts a broad, comparative perspective on the topics which were analysed. The Synopsis is by no means the only reporting tool. Rather, it is embedded into an elaborate reporting infrastructure. While the Synopsis is designed to adopt a broad, comparative perspective and mostly presents analyses on an aggregate level, the other elements of the reporting infrastructure, such as the Intelligence Briefs, provide in-depth analyses of selected topics and more country-specific context knowledge.

<sup>2</sup> [http://www.eurostudent.eu/download\\_files/documents/Annual\\_Report\\_2013.pdf](http://www.eurostudent.eu/download_files/documents/Annual_Report_2013.pdf), section "Facilitating the use of EUROSTUDENT results and data"



*Intelligence Briefs* are short, stimulating documents presenting information and interpretative help on specific topics covered in the EUROSTUDENT data set. They focus analytically on a certain topic area or certain group of students or stylistically on a certain target reader group.

A further key element of the reporting infrastructure is the *Data Reporting Module* (DRM). This is a publicly accessible online database containing all data collected from the national contributors. It can be used by researchers and the interested public. The data are commented on by the national teams. For each indicator, the user can download data sheets with all entries from all countries.

For all countries, so-called *National Profiles* are available through the DRM. These profiles are downloadable reports containing all data that a country has delivered on the set of EUROSTUDENT indicators. In addition, they include background information on the country's higher education system as well as the commentaries made by the national research teams on the quality and comparability of their data. For the majority of indicators, interpretations of the data from a national perspective are also available.

The *EUROSTUDENT events* can also be considered as an element of the reporting infrastructure. Throughout the project life cycle, a number of project meetings, intensive seminars, workshops as well as two conferences were carried out. During most meetings, EUROSTUDENT indicators and data conventions were developed together, presented, and discussed with the EUROSTUDENT Consortium members and the national research teams. These meetings were mainly organised by the Central Coordination Team, but also by the other consortium partners in cooperation with national ministries or agencies of higher education to assure that the technical and methodological discussions leading to the generation of indicators are policy-relevant.


Further important reporting elements lie in the area of responsibility of the national teams. Most importantly, the majority of national teams publish *national reports*. These reports offer in-depth analyses of students' social and economic conditions within a specific country.

A few countries publish special *associated reports*. These reports adopt the perspective of a single country and discuss their data in an international comparison, i.e. against the background of data from all or a selection of EUROSTUDENT countries. By bringing in an international perspective, these reports highlight idiosyncrasies of national higher education systems that could not be observed from a strictly national perspective. A number of reports in this vein will be produced within the framework of EUROSTUDENT V (e.g. for Norway).<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup> <http://tinyurl.com/NOnatrep>

Figure 1.4

## Structure and chapter sequence of the EUROSTUDENT V Synopsis of Indicators



The numbers in brackets refer to the number of subtopics by topic area in E:V, i.e. 13 subtopics concerned with students' resources.

### Structure of the report

The structure of the 5<sup>th</sup> Synopsis of Indicators is the result of a discussion process involving the entire EUROSTUDENT Network. The aim of the discussions was to improve the structure and to streamline the chapter sequence in comparison with the EUROSTUDENT IV Synopsis of Indicators. Figure 1.4 illustrates the result.

The Synopsis focuses on three main topic areas: access to higher education and characteristics of students (> [Chapters 2, 3, 4](#)), study conditions (> [Chapters 5, 6, 7, 8, 9](#)) as well as international student mobility, assessment of studies and future plans (> [Chapters 10, 11](#)). The chapter sequence reflects the life-course perspective from the transition into higher education to a forecast on future activities. The model underlying Figure 1.4 considers the possibility that students might re-enter higher education at a later stage in their lives – and thereby acknowledges that former ‘one-stop students’ are gradually becoming lifelong learners. However, it is important to note that EUROSTUDENT is based on cross-sectional student surveys and is therefore not designed to provide information on student graduation or students’ transition into the labour market.

The chapters of the Synopsis all follow the same structure. The first page of each chapter summarises the *Key Findings*. In the second part, the *Main Issues* dealt with in the respective chapter are described. In particular, this section highlights the main questions a chapter addresses and puts these questions into a broader political or research context. The next part of each chapter provides *Methodological and Conceptual Notes*,



## Box 1.4

**How to read the Synopsis of Indicators****Notes on the concept of the Synopsis**

- **Scope:** The Synopsis is a compendium of indicators on the social dimension of higher education in the EUROSTUDENT countries. It is designed to adopt a broad, comparative perspective. It mostly presents analyses on an aggregate level.
- **Reporting infrastructure:** The Synopsis is embedded into an elaborate reporting infrastructure. In the text, references are made to other elements of the reporting infrastructure. This is indicated by an arrow (e.g. >DRM).
- **Chapter structure:** Each chapter is structured into five main sections: Key findings, Main Issues, Methodological and Conceptual Notes, Data and Interpretation, and Discussion and Policy Considerations. In the text, references to other chapters are indicated by an arrow (e.g. >Introduction).
- **Appendices:** Each chapter concludes with a table appendix providing additional data on topics covered in the chapters. This report includes a list of the national contributors to EUROSTUDENT V (>Appendix A), metadata on national surveys (>Appendix B) and key background data on the higher education systems covered (>Appendices C and D).

**Notes on the EUROSTUDENT data**

- **Student survey:** EUROSTUDENT collates data from student surveys. In contrast to graduate surveys, it is not designed to provide information on student graduation and the transition into the labour market.
- **EUROSTUDENT Conventions:** The basis for data comparisons across countries are the EUROSTUDENT Conventions. Inter alia, they define the standard target group of the national surveys (Box 1.2). Not all countries manage to fully comply with the Conventions (Box 1.3). This is indicated in the respective figures and explained in the section Methodological and Conceptual Notes in each chapter.
- **Choice of Indicators:** The Synopsis presents only a selection of the indicators for which data were collected. Commented data on all indicators are available in the >DRM. However, it should be noted that some countries did not provide data and/or comments for all indicators.
- **Focus groups:** Many indicators further differentiate the figures for all students by so-called focus groups. These are groups of students considered as particularly relevant from a political point of view (Box 1.1). The 21 focus groups may overlap, for instance, a student can be a Master student, a delayed transition student and 30 years or older at the same time.
- **Aggregate data:** The analyses presented in the Synopsis are based on aggregate data collected from the national contributors. Micro data are not at the disposition of the Coordination Team. For this reason, differences between countries cannot be tested for statistical significance.

**Notes on the interpretation of EUROSTUDENT indicators**

- **No rankings:** The data in many charts are sorted in ascending or descending order. This should not be misinterpreted as a suggestion for a strict ranking of countries. Rather, this is done to enable the recognition of country clusters.

- **Interpretation of differences:** Small differences between countries should not be over-interpreted, as it cannot be excluded that they arise from methodological differences in conducting the national surveys.
- **Rounding:** Small deviations between figures, tables and the DRM may occur due to rounding. Similarly, due to rounding, percentages in tables may not add up to 100 %.
- **Mean and median values:** Occasionally, unweighted mean and median values of all EUROSTUDENT countries are used in the charts and text as a first orientation. They should be read with caution because they may conceal differences between countries in terms of the size of the national student and sample populations.
- **Comparisons over time:** The Synopsis of Indicators does not include comparisons of values for countries over time. This is for two reasons: On the one hand, the focus of EUROSTUDENT is to facilitate cross-country comparisons in order to better understand the general picture and the diversity of situations between (groups of) countries. On the other hand, small changes in the EUROSTUDENT Conventions, which were meant to improve the cross-country comparability of the data, limit the suitability for comparisons over time. We therefore believe that national reports or indeed reports comparing a limited number of countries are better suited to provide comparisons over time.
- **Stimulation of further research and debates:** The aggregate figures presented in the Synopsis provide an overview of the characteristics of different national student populations. They often do not facilitate the identification of the causes for the phenomena observed. The authors hope that the general overview will encourage further research and policy debates trying to explain the findings of the Synopsis from national standpoints.

explaining indicators and deviations from EUROSTUDENT Conventions in national surveys. The main part of each chapter is the *Data and Interpretation* section. It presents a selection of EUROSTUDENT indicators, focusing on the questions and topics identified as relevant in the Main Issues section. The *Discussion and Policy Considerations* section summarises the main empirical findings and highlights their implications, relating back to the key questions asked initially, and creating possible approaches for further research. Every chapter closes with a table appendix providing additional data on topics covered in the chapters.

To conclude this introduction, Box 1.4 brings together all important issues that should be kept in mind while reading the Synopsis.

## Acknowledgements

The EUROSTUDENT V – Synopsis of Indicators is the product of a European-wide network including researchers and data collectors, representatives of national ministries and other stakeholders collaborating to examine the social and economic conditions of student life in higher education system in Europe.

First of all, the entire Central Coordination Team at DZHW, headed by Dominic Orr, would like to express its greatest gratitude to the network partners from the 30 contributing countries for their continuous support of the EUROSTUDENT Network, for

sharing their expertise with the authors, and particularly for their diligent efforts to deliver reliable and accurate data on the EUROSTUDENT indicators. We are also grateful for three years of productive and encouraging collaboration with the members of the EUROSTUDENT Consortium. In the same way, we would like to express our sincere thanks to the former and current members of the Steering Board (Mette Moerk Andersen, Laurence Boegli, Katrin Fohmann, Marzia Foroni, Elisabeth Gehrke, Mads Gravas, Maria-Kristin Gylfadottir, Florian Kaiser, Melissa Keizer, Marlies Leegwater, Kathleen Ordnung, Jesper Risom, Carole Waldvogel, Monique Ronzeau, Věra Štátná, Tomislav Vodička) and stakeholders who have contributed significantly to EUROSTUDENT becoming a major network of experts on the social dimension of higher education in Europe.

The authors of the report are further especially grateful to Stefania Giannini and Jan Sadlak for two very enlightening forewords as well as to our chapter peers for providing valuable comments on draft chapters of the Synopsis: Jakob Hartl, Martin Unger (IHS), Bas Kurver, Froukje Wartenbergh-Cras (ResearchNed), Danja Oste (ECStA), and Kai Mühleck (DZHW). Finally, thanks are due to the team behind the scenes at DZHW, whose support was invaluable in the course of the project: Viktor Dick, who programmed and maintained the DDM, Clemens Mrosek and Matthias Liedtke, who assisted in nearly everything, and Jeanette Ihnen, Torben Rauhut, Danielle Sanfilippo, Hendrik Schirmer, and Meike Wenzel, who each supported the project in a variety of ways.

## Chapter 2

# Transition into higher education

### Key findings

- **Alternative access routes to higher education:** Alternative access routes to higher education are offered in most EUROSTUDENT countries. In the majority of countries, especially students without higher education background, delayed transition, and older students benefit from these entry routes.
- **Delayed transition students:** In around one fifth of the EUROSTUDENT countries, more than 20 % of the students enter higher education with a delay of more than 24 months after leaving school for the first time. In all EUROSTUDENT countries, the share of such delayed transition students is greater among students without higher education background than among their counterparts with higher education background.
- **Students with (regular) work experience before entering higher education:** In all EUROSTUDENT countries, there are students who have worked regularly, for at least one year, before entering higher education. Work experience prior to entering higher education is related to students' personal situations and characteristics. In almost all EUROSTUDENT countries, the share of students with prior work experience is higher among students without higher education background than among those with higher education background. In all of the EUROSTUDENT countries, the share of students with work experience before entering higher education is higher among students who are older than 30 years than among their younger peers.
- **Students with an interruption of at least one year between entering higher education and graduating:** In around 40% of EUROSTUDENT countries, at least 10 % of students have interrupted their studies for at least one year between entering higher education and graduating. The share of students with interruptions during their higher education studies is especially high among older students and among delayed transition students compared to their respective counterparts.

## Main issues

Widening access to higher education and improving the quality of higher education across Europe are perceived as central in creating knowledge-based societies and in enhancing the employability of higher education graduates (European Commission, 2011). Increasing participation in higher education is also a focus of the recent modernisation agenda and the Europe 2020 strategy (European Commission, EACEA, & Eurydice, 2014). The entry routes to higher education and students' transition pathways are vital in improving access for all.

This chapter, therefore, looks at students' transition into higher education across EUROSTUDENT countries and across student groups by examining different access routes to higher education, the time delay between obtaining a school leaving qualification and higher education participation, prior experience on the labour market, and the occurrence of interruptions during higher education.

### Regular and alternative access routes to higher education

Widening higher education access within the context of the social dimension has also been reaffirmed repeatedly during the various communiqués. In the 2007 London Communiqué, ministers agreed that *'...the student body entering and participating in higher education should reflect the diversity of the populations (p. 5)'* (London Communiqué, 2007). In the more recent Bucharest Communiqué, ministers agreed *'...to support national measures for widening access by means of alternative access routes, flexible learning paths, and recognition of prior learning (p. 1)'* (Bucharest Communiqué, 2012). The Bucharest Communiqué thus clearly recognises the need for expanding entry routes to higher education by means of introducing alternative or second chance access routes (Orr & Hovdhaugen, 2014) to enable diverse student groups participate in higher education, irrespective of their prior formal qualifications (Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency, 2012).

In many higher education systems, 'regular' access routes to higher education include qualifications that provide its holders with a direct entry into the higher education system (Orr et. al., 2011; Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency, 2012). These generally include upper secondary qualifications and/or central higher education entrance examinations (Box 2.1 and Methodological and conceptual notes). On the other hand, the 'second chance' or 'alternative' entry routes open up higher education access opportunities for individuals who did not, originally, have qualifications that provide them with a direct entry to higher education (Orr et. al., 2011; Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency, 2012). The alternative entry routes to higher education vary across countries but often include accreditation/recognition of prior learning and bridging programmes or short courses. These are offered in about half of the European higher education systems, especially in northern and western Europe (Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency, 2014). These alternative access routes, and, in particular, the recognition of prior learning are also perceived as central in contributing towards lifelong learning (European Commission, EACEA, & Eurydice, 2014). In this context, this chapter examines the types of access routes offered by various higher education systems and the share of students entering higher education through the regular and alternative routes.

## Transition into higher education and learning pathways

Related to the concept of lifelong learning and alternative access routes to higher education is also the transition pathway that different student groups follow to enter higher education. One of the ways of understanding students' transition pathways is to look at the group of students who delay their transition into the higher education. These “delayed transition” students are most likely to be older and first-generation learners (Orr, Gwosć, & Netz, 2011; Orr, 2012). A variety of factors influence students' decision to participate in higher education after leaving school. These factors are related to their education systems, family obligations, social backgrounds, economic reasons, and personal choices such as working or volunteering prior to entering higher education (Orr, Gwosć, & Netz, 2011). Examining the share of delayed transition students in higher education, also, to a certain extent, examines possibilities for life-long learners in the higher education system.

In this context, this chapter further examines the share of delayed transition students in higher education across countries and student groups. This chapter also examines the prior work experience of students as it appears to be related to the delay in entering higher education. The occurrence of interruptions during the entire study process, i.e. between entering higher education and graduating, is also investigated.

## Methodological and conceptual notes

In understanding students' access and transition pathways into higher education, three aspects are considered in this chapter: entry/access routes, transition pathways, and interruptions during higher education.

### Students' entry/access routes

Many countries offer prospective students with more than one access route to higher education. Box 2.1 illustrates the different access routes to higher education in the EUROSTUDENT context and their classification into regular and alternative access routes<sup>1</sup>.


The regular entry routes to higher education generally include upper secondary qualification (ISCED 2011 34/35) and/or central higher education entrance exams for all students. In many countries, an upper secondary qualification is often the traditional direct entry route to most higher education institutions. In some countries and school types, it may combine both elements of academic and vocational training. The regular path into the higher education in several countries also includes an entrance examination wherein all prospective higher education students have to pass a central higher education entrance examination in order to gain access to the higher education.

In addition to regular entry routes, many countries offer other access routes to higher education for students who left school without an upper secondary qualification granting them direct access. These include:

<sup>1</sup> The question on students' access routes provided multiple response options, so that students may have combined different routes to enter higher education.

## Box 2.1

## Routes into higher education



- **Upper secondary school academic track through adult learning – ISCED 2011 34/35/44/45:** This type of alternative access route involves obtaining the normal upper secondary leaving qualification after leaving the school system, often through courses for adult learners.
- **Special entry exams for certain student groups:** This involves taking special examinations which are used to assess the capabilities of candidates for higher education entry, who do not have the regular entry qualifications.
- **Special access course:** Graduating from a special access course, usually offered by the higher education institutions for specific subject areas, e.g. mathematics, may lead to candidates' acceptance to higher education, usually in combination with other prior learning or experiences.
- **Accreditation/recognition of prior learning and/or vocational experience:** This alternative entry route takes into account any former formal or informal training of the prospective students in determining access to higher education.

### Transition pathways

In examining students' transition pathways, three aspects are considered: the share and the characteristics of delayed transition students, prior experiences of students on the labour market, and the occurrence of interruptions in their educational career. Delayed transition students are classified as all students who experience a delay between leaving school for the first time and entering higher education for the first time that amounts to more than two years.

The analyses on transition pathways also include an examination of students' prior experiences on the labour market. Students' prior work experiences can be categorised into 'casual' and 'regular' jobs. In the context of EUROSTUDENT, casual jobs are classified as gainful employment for less than one year or jobs in which the student worked for less than 20 hours per week. On the other hand, regular jobs include employment activities that lasted for at least one year and in which the student spent more than 20



hours per week. For the analyses of students' prior work experience, only regular paid jobs are considered.

The category 'interruptions during educational career' includes an analysis of students who experienced a break of at least one year between entering and graduating from higher education for the first time.

### Notes on national surveys

For a number of countries, the data on indicators related to students' alternative access routes to higher education and their transition pathways are of limited international comparability.

- According to the EUROSTUDENT survey conventions, the question on students' access route had the possibility of choosing multiple responses. However, some countries (Austria, France, Germany, and Switzerland) did not pose this as a multiple response question.
- In the Netherlands, data on alternative access routes through adult learning (*Mbo*) are of limited international comparability because students who are 16 years or older can also enroll in *Mbo*. Thus, it may not always be considered as adult learning.
- For a few countries (Austria, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, and Slovenia) the data with regard to delayed transition students are of limited international comparability. On the basis of Austrian data, it is difficult to differentiate between 'leaving school for the first time' and 'obtaining higher education entrance qualification'. Therefore, in the case of Austria, the number of delayed transition students might be slightly underrepresented. Contrary to the EUROSTUDENT survey conventions, in the Czech Republic, the group of delayed transition students also includes students from Slovakia who obtained their leaving qualifications in the Czech Republic. Estonia, France, and Slovenia calculated the time delay between leaving school for the first time and entering higher education based on years instead of months.
- France and Romania also indicated limited comparability for the data on experience on the labour market before entering higher education. In France students who engaged in vocational training before entering higher education are also included in the category 'regular job' before entering higher education. In Romania, the majority of students do not have any work experience prior to entering higher education.
- Romania and Switzerland have indicated limited comparability with regard to their data on interruption between entering and graduating from higher education. In Romania, the question associated with the indicator was not posed as a multiple response question. In the case of Switzerland, it is not possible to differentiate between 'interruption between entering higher education and graduating' and 'interruption between graduating from higher education and re-entering'. This is because these data are based on registry records.

### Strengths and shortcomings of EUROSTUDENT data

EUROSTUDENT data on students' transition into higher education capture the different types of access routes offered in EUROSTUDENT countries. They provide information on the social and educational background of the students entering higher education via alternative access routes. Further, EUROSTUDENT data allow for examining the share and characteristics of the delayed transition students within the higher edu-



cation systems across countries. Information on the social and educational background of students is generally not captured completely by administrative statistics.

Data on this topic are somewhat difficult to standardise and capture. It should therefore be noted that the data in this chapter are better suited towards overall comparisons rather than detailed analyses of any one country.

## Data and interpretation

### Students entering higher education through regular and alternative routes

**Alternative access routes to higher education are offered in most EUROSTUDENT countries**


In all countries, the share of students entering higher education through a regular route – either upper secondary qualification and/or central higher education entrance examination – is greater than the share of students entering higher education through alternative routes.

- In 18 of the 25 EUROSTUDENT countries for which data are available, at least four in five students have entered higher education via the regular route (upper secondary qualification or central higher education entrance examination) (>DRM). In the remaining countries, this share is at least 70 %.
- In 60% of these 25 countries, the share of students entering higher education via upper secondary qualification is greater than the share of students entering higher education via the central higher education examinations. In Slovakia, Georgia, Estonia, Lithuania, Poland, and Latvia at least 95 % of students enter higher education via upper secondary qualifications (>DRM).
- In Georgia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Serbia, and Montenegro, more than 95 % of students enter higher education via central higher education entrance examinations (>DRM).
- In 18 of the 25 countries at least one alternative access route seems to have been used by the students (Figure 2.1). The national systems offer a mix of options for alternative routes which can be grouped into four main routes: upper secondary school academic track through adult learning, special exam for certain student groups, special access courses, and recognition of prior learning (Methodological and conceptual notes).
- *Upper secondary school academic track through adult learning:* In 11 countries, students indicated that they used upper secondary academic track through adult learning to enter higher education (Figure 2.1 and Figure 2.2.). In Armenia, Germany, Ireland, the Netherlands, and Sweden, more than 10 % of students enter higher education via upper secondary school academic track through adult learning. In the remaining six countries, the share of students entering higher education via this route is less than 5 %. An example of this type of alternative access route is the Further Education and Training Awards Council (FETAC) Level 5 or 6 in Ireland. In Sweden, some students take adult learning courses to improve their grades, thereby, increasing their prospects of gaining entry into higher education.
- *Special exam for certain student groups:* In nine EUROSTUDENT countries, students indicated that they entered higher education via special exams (Figure 2.1 and Figure 2.2). For instance, in Armenia, graduates of vocational schools can take special exams to enter higher education. In Russia and Sweden, more than 10 % of students have indicated that they utilised special exam for certain student groups to enter

Figure 2.1

## Students entering higher education through alternative routes

Share of students (in %)



Data source: EUROSTUDENT V, B4. No data: FI, HU, IT, RO.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 2.4 What qualifications, examinations or measures qualified you for entry into higher education?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions: AT, CH, DE, FR, NL.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: DE, GE, IT.


higher education.<sup>2</sup> In the remaining countries, the share of students entering higher education via a special exam for certain student groups varies between less than 1% in Estonia to around 7% in Ukraine.

- **Special access courses:** Special access courses to enter higher education were used by students in 11 EUROSTUDENT countries (Figure 2.1 and Figure 2.2). The share of students having entered higher education via this route varies between less than 1% in Estonia to 9% in Ireland. In France, for instance, prospective higher education students without a *Baccalauréat* can enter higher education after obtaining *Diplôme d'Accès aux Etudes Universitaires (DAEU)*, which is obtained after completing a course at the university. This course is offered to students who are older than 24 years. Students older than 20 years but younger than 24 years can also access these courses if they have at least two years of work experience.
- **Recognition/ accreditation of prior learning:** Students in 13 countries indicated that they used recognition/accreditation of prior learning to enter higher education (Figure 2.1 and Figure 2.2). In Malta and Norway, more than 10% of students have used accreditation of prior learning to enter higher education. In Malta, students entering via this route use the *Maturity clause* to enter higher education. This implies that students older than 23 years in age without formal higher education entrance qualifications can enter higher education on the basis of their prior employment experience.
- **Many national higher education systems offer more than one alternative access route to higher education (Figure 2.2).** The three circles in Figure 2.2. illustrate the three main types of alternative access routes: upper secondary school academic track through adult learning, special exam for certain student groups and/or special access courses, and recognition of prior learning. In eight higher education systems, at least three different types of alternative higher education access routes were used by students (Armenia, Austria, Croatia, Estonia, Ireland, Sweden, Switzerland, and Russia).

2 In Sweden, this number may also include students who have taken the scholastic aptitude test.

Figure 2.2

## Mix of alternative routes by country



**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, B.4. **No data:** FI, HU, IT, RO.

**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 2.4. What qualifications, examinations or measures qualified you for entry into higher education?

**Notes:** Special access courses and special examinations for certain student groups are grouped together.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** AT, CH, DE, FR, NL.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

**Alternative access routes in most countries are used by students without higher education background, delayed transition students, and older students**

Further analysis of the alternative routes provides an interesting overview of the differences in the students' personal characteristics entering higher education via these routes in the EUROSTUDENT countries (Table A2.1).

- In Germany, Ireland, the Netherlands, and Sweden, the share of students without higher education background entering higher education via upper secondary school academic track through adult learning is at least 18% (Table A2.1). The share of delayed transition students entering higher education via this route is especially high in Armenia, Ireland, the Netherlands and Ukraine. At least 30% of the delayed transition students in these countries reported to have used this route (Table A2.2).
- Especially delayed transition students appear to benefit from special exams for certain student groups. In Slovenia and Ukraine, more than 30% of the delayed transition students have entered higher education via this route, and in Russia, more than 60% of the delayed transition students utilise this route (Table A2.2). Also, older students tend to enter higher education via this route more often than their younger peers in all countries (Table A2.2).
- In all of the countries in which students entered through recognition/accreditation of prior learning, the share of students without higher education background entering through recognition/accreditation of prior learning is greater compared to their counterparts with higher education background (Table A2.1). In Ireland, Norway and Russia more than 15% of the delayed transition students have entered higher education through this route. As might have been expected, older students enter higher education via this route more frequently than younger students.
- It appears that in all countries, especially students without higher education background, delayed transition students, and older students benefit from these alternative entry routes. Further, the share of students who enter higher education via

alternative access route is also related to the type of higher education institution (>DRM). In the majority of countries the share of students who enter higher education via alternative access route is higher among non-university students than among university students.

### Delayed transition students

In understanding students' transition pathways to higher education, the following analysis takes a closer look at the share and characteristics of the students who entered higher education with a delay of more than 24 months after first leaving the school system.

The share of delayed transition students fluctuates between less than 5 % in Slovenia, France, and Malta to more than 30 % in the Nordic countries (Sweden, Norway, Finland, and Denmark) (Figure 2.3). In around one fifth of the EUROSTUDENT countries, more than 20 % of the students enter higher education with a delay of more than 24 months after leaving school for the first time. In another two fifths of the countries, this share is between 10 % and 20 %.


- In all EUROSTUDENT countries, apart from Denmark and Montenegro, the share of delayed transition students is greater among students without higher education background than among their counterparts with higher education background (Figure 2.3). This difference is especially high (at least 10 percentage points) in Sweden, Finland, Norway, Ireland, Hungary, Estonia, and the Czech Republic.
- In almost all countries for which data are available, the share of delayed transition students is higher among low intensity students than among high intensity students. (Table A2.3).

*Students without higher education background enter higher education more often with a delay of more than 24 months after leaving school for the first time*

**Figure 2.3**

**Students with time delay of more than 24 months between leaving school for the first time and entering higher education by educational background**

Share of students (in %)



**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, B13, B14.

**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 2.3 When did you obtain the qualification mentioned in 2.1 [highest level of education obtained on graduating from the school system for the first time]? 2.6 When did you enter higher education for the first time?

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** AT, CZ, EE, FR, SI.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

- In the majority of countries the share of delayed transition students among those dependent on their own earnings is also higher than among students dependent on family or public support (Table A2.3).

### Students with (regular) work experience before entering higher education

*In all EUROSTUDENT countries, the share of students with work experience before entering higher education is higher among students without higher education background and older students than among their respective peers*

In all EUROSTUDENT countries, there are students who have worked regularly, for at least one year, before entering higher education.

- The share of students with (regular) work experience before entering higher education varies from more than 30% in Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Finland, Estonia, Switzerland, and Slovenia to less than 10% in Croatia, France, Armenia, Serbia, Ukraine, Bosnia-Herzegovina, and Georgia (Figure 2.4).

- Work experience prior to entering higher education is related to students' personal situations and characteristics. In almost all EUROSTUDENT countries, the share of students with prior work experience is higher among students without higher education background than among those with higher education background. In Norway, Switzerland, Slovenia, Malta, Austria, and Czech Republic this difference is at least 10 percentage points (Figure 2.4a).

- In all of the EUROSTUDENT countries, the share of students with work experience before entering higher education is higher among students who are older than 30 years than among their younger peers (Figure 2.4b). In 70% of the EUROSTUDENT countries, the share of older students with prior experience is at least 40 percentage points higher than that of younger students.

- Further, in all EUROSTUDENT countries the share of students with work experience before entering higher education is higher among low intensity students than among high intensity students. The share is also higher among delayed transition students in all countries (Table A2.4).

- In summary, students with work experience before entering higher education are more often older, without higher education background, delayed transition, and studying with low intensity. It is likely that a majority of them are still engaged in paid jobs alongside their studies. These students groups are also more often engaged in paid jobs that are closely related to their field of study. This may be an indication that these are the students who return to study in a field related to their occupation (>Chapter 6).

### Students with an interruption of at least one year between entering higher education and graduating

*Older students experience interruption of at least one year between entering higher education and graduating more often than their younger counterparts*


In all EUROSTUDENT countries, the share of students with no occurrence of interruption during higher education studies ranges from 68% to 98% (>DRM). In eight countries, at least 90% of students experience no interruption between entering and graduating from higher education (Ukraine, Russia, Germany, the Netherlands, Slovakia, Czech Republic, Austria, and Bosnia-Herzegovina).

Although small in number, it is important to examine the characteristics of students who interrupt their studies after the commencement of higher education and before completion. This indicator illustrates the differences with regard to the flexibility of different higher education systems in enabling students take a break during their courses and the possibility to return to studies following such a break (Figure 2.5).

Figure 2.4

**Students with (regular) work experience before entering higher education by educational background and age groups**

Share of students (in %)



**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, B.7, B.8. **No data:** DE; at least 25 but younger than 30 years: UA; at least 30 years: UA. **Too few cases:** At least 30 years: GE.

**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 2.9. Did you have a paid job before entering higher education for the first time?

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** FR, RO.


**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

- In two fifths of EUROSTUDENT countries, at least 10 % of students have an interruption of at least one year between entering higher education and graduating from higher education (Figure 2.5). In Estonia, Georgia, Finland, and Norway, at least 15 % of students have experienced an interruption between higher education enrolment and graduation. On the other hand, this share is less than 5 % in the Netherlands, Slovakia, Russia, and Ukraine.
- In more than half of the countries the share of students with interruptions is higher among delayed transition students (Figure 2.5a).
- In all of the EUROSTUDENT countries the share of students with interruptions between higher education commencement and graduation is higher among older students than among younger students (Figure 2.5b).

Figure 2.5

### Students with an interruption of at least one year between entering higher education and graduating by transition route and age groups

Share of students (in %)



**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, B.10, B.11. **No data:** IT; delayed transition: MT, PL; at least 25 but younger than 30 years: UA; at least 30 years: UA.

**Too few cases:** At least 30 years: GE.

**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 2.8. Did you ever interrupt your education career after entering higher education for at least one year?

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** CH, RO.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

- Further, in all EUROSTUDENT countries, this share is higher among low intensity students than among their high intensity peers (Table A2.5).
- Again, students who experience an interruption between entering and graduating from higher education share common characteristics with the students who enter higher education with prior experience on the labour market. Very often these students enter higher education with a delay, are studying with low intensity, do not have a higher education background, and are older. They also engage in paid employment alongside their studies more often (>Chapter 6). It is also found that these students consider themselves as primarily workers (>DRM), suggesting that they tend to pursue their studies differently from their peers.



## Discussion and policy considerations

Different student groups require different levels and types of support during their higher education studies. Widening access to higher education within the context of the ‘social dimension’ entails supporting diverse student bodies in entering and participating in higher education. One of the ways to achieve this is by introducing alternative access routes to higher education. This would ensure that higher education access opportunities are provided to all irrespective of their former school leaving qualifications. Such alternative access routes to higher education exist in most of the EUROSTUDENT countries. In the majority of countries, especially students without higher education background, delayed transition students, and older students benefit from these routes. Similar findings were also reported in the last round of the EUROSTUDENT project and the recent Eurydice report. Specifically, looking at delayed transition students, it is observed that these students tend to not have a higher education background and more often pursue their studies with low intensity. These students also engage in paid employment alongside studies more often compared to all students (>Chapter 6). Further, students who experience an interruption during their higher education studies also share some characteristics with the delayed transition students. More often these students are without higher education background, older, study with low intensity, and are dependent on their own income.

This clearly highlights that the educational trajectories and the needs of the students who have entered higher education with a delay are different from the so-called ‘traditional’ students. >Chapter 3, >Chapter 4, and >Chapter 5 will further examine how ‘non-traditional’ students study in the different EUROSTUDENT countries. While expanding entry routes to higher education is one way of supporting these students, introducing flexible learning pathways and student-centred learning could be another way to reduce the occurrence of interruptions in these students’ educational pathways and ensure successful graduation.



# Tables

2

Table A2.1

## Students entering higher education through alternative routes by educational background

Share of students (in %)

Country	With HE background				Without HE background			
	Upper second-ary school academic track through adult learning (ISCED 34/35/44/45)	Special exam for certain student groups	Special access courses	Accreditation of prior learning and/or vocational experience (APR)	Upper second-ary school academic track through adult learning (ISCED 34/35/44/45)	Special exam for certain student groups	Special access courses	Accreditation of prior learning and/or vocational experience (APR)
AM	10	1	8	0.4	10	3	9	2
AT	1	2	1	0.1	1	5	3	0.4
CH	4	1	n/a	2	3	2	n/a	5
DE	7	n/a	n/a	1	18	n/a	n/a	1
EE	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.4	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.2
FR	n/a	n/a	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	1	n/a
GE	n/a	n/a	2	n/a	n/a	n/a	2	n/a
HR	1	n/a	1	1	1	n/a	2	1
IE	10	n/a	6	5	18	n/a	11	7
LT	n/a	n/a	n/a	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	2
LV	n/a	n/a	n/a	–	n/a	n/a	n/a	–
MT	n/a	2	n/a	7	n/a	2	n/a	16
NL	12	n/a	n/a	n/a	27	n/a	n/a	n/a
NO	n/a	n/a	n/a	19	n/a	n/a	n/a	19
RU	1	11	1	3	0.1	1	0.3	7
SE	12	17	4	3	21	18	4	4
SI	n/a	2	0.4	n/a	n/a	7	0.3	n/a
UA	4	7	2	n/a	7	8	2	n/a

– no data

Data source: EUROSTUDENT V, B5.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 2.4 What qualifications, examinations or measures qualified you for entry into higher education?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions: AT, CH, DE, FR, NL.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: DE, GE, IT.

Table A2.2

**Students entering higher education through alternative routes by transition route and selected age groups**

Share of students (in %)

Country	Delayed				Younger than 22 years				At least 30 years			
	Upper secondary school academic track through adult learning (ISCED 34/35/44/45)	Special exam for certain student groups	Special access courses	Accreditation of prior learning and/or vocational experience (APR)	Upper secondary school academic track through adult learning (ISCED 34/35/44/45)	Special exam for certain student groups	Special access courses	Accreditation of prior learning and/or vocational experience (APR)	Upper secondary school academic track through adult learning (ISCED 34/35/44/45)	Special exam for certain student groups	Special access courses	Accreditation of prior learning and/or vocational experience (APR)
AM	30	3	9	0.4	9	1	8	0.2	15	6	5	5
AT	1	21	15	0.4	0.1	1	0.1	0	2	9	9	1
CH	1	4	n/a	14	2	1	n/a	0.4	4	4	n/a	17
DE	10	n/a	n/a	1	3	n/a	n/a	0.3	29	n/a	n/a	5
EE	0	0	0	0.3	0	0	0	0.3	0	0	0.2	1
FR	n/a	n/a	6	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	8	n/a
GE	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	2	n/a	•	•	•	•
HR	1	n/a	1	5	0.3	n/a	0.3	0.2	2	n/a	2	3
IE	41	n/a	21	15	4	n/a	1	0.4	31	n/a	25	19
LT	n/a	n/a	n/a	6	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.3	n/a	n/a	n/a	5
LV	n/a	n/a	n/a	–	n/a	n/a	n/a	–	n/a	n/a	n/a	–
MT	–	–	–	–	n/a	1	n/a	0.2	n/a	6	n/a	43
NL	56	n/a	n/a	n/a	8	n/a	n/a	n/a	41	n/a	n/a	n/a
NO	n/a	n/a	n/a	15	n/a	n/a	n/a	22	n/a	n/a	n/a	20
RU	5	64	1	39	0	6	0.2	1	0	87	3	19
SE	26	14	4	4	2	17	3	0	29	16	4	7
SI	n/a	33	0	n/a	n/a	0.3	0.3	n/a	n/a	41	2	n/a
UA	62	42	1	n/a	4	6	2	n/a	–	–	–	–

– no data • too few cases

Data source: EUROSTUDENT V, B5.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 2.4 What qualifications, examinations or measures qualified you for entry into higher education?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions: AT, CH, DE, FR, NL.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: DE, GE, IT.

Table A2.3

**Students with time delay of more than 24 months between leaving school for the first time and entering higher education by study intensity, sex and dependency on income source**

Share of students (in %)

Country	All students	High intensity	Low intensity	Male	Female	Dependent on family support	Dependent on own earnings	Dependent on public support
AM	11	11	19	13	10	–	–	–
AT	21	19	23	24	18	10	26	57
BA	8	4	16	8	7	7	27	0
CH	10	7	16	10	10	5	17	14
CZ	12	2	22	9	14	–	–	–
DE	12	12	14	12	13	9	17	16
DK	30	30	27	30	29	50	34	35
EE	15	15	15	16	15	13	17	15
FI	39	38	43	41	38	39	44	30
FR	2	2	3	2	2	1	5	2
GE	7	8	7	8	7	7	5	•
HR	7	3	9	37	7	4	22	2
HU	17	12	20	16	17	9	34	9
IE	20	24	28	25	15	9	28	18
IT	9	6	17	10	8	7	46	17
LT	8	7	10	6	10	5	12	1
LV	12	10	12	13	11	8	17	10
ME	13	22	16	16	11	13	22	•
MT	2	2	4	3	2	2	3	1
NL	12	8	17	13	10	5	25	7
NO	39	36	45	44	35	40	49	32
PL	17	15	15	19	16	13	20	–
RO	8	6	12	11	7	–	–	–
RS	7	6	8	9	6	6	18	3
RU	11	41	8	13	10	–	–	–
SE	47	46	49	42	51	41	52	46
SI	3	2	2	2	3	1	7	0
SK	14	6	26	12	16	5	29	5
UA	6	6	6	9	5	6	8	6

– no data • too few cases

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, B13, B14, B15.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 2.3 When did you obtain the qualification mentioned in 2.1 [highest level of education obtained on graduating from the school system for the first time]? 2.6 When did you enter higher education for the first time?**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** AT, CZ, EE, FR, SI.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

Table A2.4

**Students with (regular) work experience before entering higher education by study intensity and transition route**

Share of students (in %)

Country	All students	High intensity	Low intensity	Delayed
AM	8	7	20	26
AT	23	19	26	83
BA	5	3	10	21
CH	33	26	46	85
CZ	18	6	33	86
DE	–	–	–	–
DK	38	37	38	69
EE	35	30	39	74
FI	37	34	40	57
FR	9	8	11	60
GE	4	4	8	3
HR	9	3	14	67
HU	15	10	21	62
IE	18	20	24	57
IT	14	8	28	58
LT	19	17	25	86
LV	13	12	15	38
ME	12	9	15	26
MT	25	13	55	–
NL	20	15	29	76
NO	46	40	52	54
PL	26	20	27	–
RO	21	15	36	77
RS	8	7	10	34
RU	13	14	16	48
SE	39	34	45	72
SI	30	25	41	93
SK	24	16	36	79
UA	6	4	9	23

– no data

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, B7, B8.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 2.9 Did you have a paid job before entering higher education for the first time?**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** FR, RO.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

Table A2.5

**Students with an interruption of at least one year between entering higher education and graduating by study intensity and educational background**

Share of students (in %)

Country	All students	High intensity	Low intensity	With HE background	Without HE background
AM	10	8	16	8	15
AT	8	5	15	8	8
BA	7	6	11	7	8
CH	5	4	6	4	4
CZ	7	4	10	8	6
DE	5	4	10	5	6
DK	10	10	11	11	10
EE	26	23	34	27	24
FI	15	13	20	18	15
FR	5	4	8	5	6
GE	16	12	21	17	13
HR	13	7	12	11	12
HU	7	2	10	7	7
IE	10	8	14	9	11
IT	–	–	–	–	–
LT	10	10	10	10	10
LV	7	5	8	8	6
ME	12	7	17	12	12
MT	6	4	14	5	6
NL	4	4	5	4	4
NO	15	12	19	16	16
PL	14	10	17	13	14
RO	5	4	6	5	4
RS	9	8	12	12	7
RU	3	2	4	3	3
SE	7	6	8	6	8
SI	12	11	17	11	14
SK	4	3	7	4	4
UA	2	2	3	2	2

– no data

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, B10, B11.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 2.8 Did you ever interrupt your education career after entering higher education for at least one year?**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** CH, RO.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

## Chapter 3

# Social background of national student populations

### Key findings

- **Educational attainment of students' parents:** In 12 EUROSTUDENT countries, more than half of all students have parents without higher education background. Italy and Malta have especially high shares of students from this background – in these countries, their share is higher than 70 %. In the remaining 17 EUROSTUDENT countries, more than half of the students' parents have attained higher education degrees themselves.
- **Educational choices of students without HE background:** Students without higher education background more often have a delayed entry into higher education, and, accordingly, are older than students with HE background in most EUROSTUDENT countries. Additionally, in the majority of EUROSTUDENT countries, the share of students without HE background is higher at non-universities than at universities. To a lesser degree, differences between students with and without higher education background are also apparent with regard to the choice of type of programme and subject choice (engineering vs. humanities).
- **Representation of students without HE background:** Students without higher education background (as measured by father's educational attainment) are under-represented in all EUROSTUDENT countries except Norway. However, differences between countries are apparent: In Austria, Ireland, Italy, Malta, and Norway, students without HE background are relatively well represented, whereas in Armenia, Denmark, and Germany, representation is low.
- **Different patterns of representation:** Closer analysis shows that students from low education background (fathers with ISCED 0–2) are actually overrepresented in Armenia, Estonia, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, and, to a lesser degree, in Finland and Malta. In these countries, the underrepresentation affects students with medium education background (ISCED 3–4). In all other EUROSTUDENT countries, students from low education backgrounds are – if slightly – underrepresented.

## Main issues

The social dimension has been an important topic in the Bologna process since it was first officially mentioned in the Prague Communiqué (2001). The Bucharest Communiqué (2012) reaffirmed the centrality of the concept: ‘The student body entering and graduating from higher education institutions should reflect the diversity of Europe’s populations. We will step up our efforts towards underrepresented groups to develop the social dimension of higher education, [and] reduce inequalities [...]’ (p. 1–2).

### Participative equity in HE

The most common interpretation of the social dimension is that a state of participative equity should be attained in European higher education. Participative equity is given when all possible social groups take part in higher education to the same degree (Mühl-heck, 2013). In principle, ideal participative equity would be attained when the make-up of the student population is exactly proportional to the make-up of the general population of the same age in all possible characteristic. In practice, specific groups known to be traditionally underrepresented in higher education in many countries have typically been in the focus of interest with regard to adequate representation in higher education. One such group is that of students without higher education background.

### Students without higher education background

Students without higher education background have parents who did not attain higher education themselves. Studies have shown that students’ education background can have an important influence on educational attainment (Shavit & Blossfeld, 1993). Students from different education backgrounds make different educational choices, not only with regard to entering higher education at all, but also with regard to choice of HEI type (Reimer & Jacob, 2011; Arum, Gamoran & Shavit, 2007) or degree length (Triventi, 2013). Theories on the reasons for these phenomena suggest different causes, from a differing “habitus” of students without higher education background preventing integration at higher education institutions (Bourdieu, 1984) to background-specific norms, resources and constraints shaping educational and career choices in different ways (Becker & Hecken, 2009; Boudon, 1974; Breen & Goldthorpe, 1997).

The EUROSTUDENT data set provides the possibility to look at students without higher education background in different ways. The analysis will concentrate on the following questions, approaching the topic both from a student and a systems perspective:

- To what extent are students without higher education background part of the student populations in the EUROSTUDENT countries? Can differences with regard to these students’ educational choices be identified?
- What is the state of participative equity in the EUROSTUDENT countries with regard to different education backgrounds?

## Methodological and conceptual notes

### Students’ education background

Students’ education background is determined by the educational attainment of their parents. Two main groups are distinguished in this chapter: students with higher edu-

**Box 3.1****The International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED) classification in the EUROSTUDENT project**

The UNESCO developed the International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED) in the 1970s in order to provide an instrument for compiling and presenting internationally comparable education statistics. The ISCED classifies educational programmes by assigning them to an ISCED level which indicates the level of education conveyed by the respective programme.

The original ISCED instrument was revised in 1997 and 2011 (UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2006, 2012). The EUROSTUDENT project makes use of both revisions in classifying the educational attainment of students' parents. The EUROSTUDENT core questionnaire stipulates that parents' highest educational attainment be classified according to ISCED 2011. In order to calculate the representation indices used in this chapter, population data was either drawn from Eurostat (2013; data set lfsa\_pgaed) or delivered by the EUROSTUDENT countries. Population data was only available based on ISCED 1997 classifications. In order to compare the survey data with the central statistics, ISCED 1997 and ISCED 2011 categories were collapsed into the categories used in EUROSTUDENT as depicted in the table below and in accordance with the official designation of concordance between ISCED 1997 and ISCED 2011 (UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2012).

ISCED 2011	ISCED 1997	EUROSTUDENT		
ISCED 01: Early childhood educational development	/	up to lower secondary education	without higher education background	low educational background
ISCED 02: Pre-Primary education	ISCED 0			
ISCED level 1: Primary education	ISCED level 1			
ISCED level 2: Lower secondary education	ISCED level 2			
ISCED level 3: Upper secondary education	ISCED level 3	with higher education background	high educational background	medium educational background
ISCED level 4: Post-secondary non-tertiary education	ISCED level 4			
ISCED level 5: Short-cycle tertiary education	ISCED level 5			
ISCED level 6: Bachelor's or equivalent level				
ISCED level 7: Master's or equivalent level				
ISCED level 8: Doctoral or equivalent level	ISCED level 6			

cation background and students without higher education background. The groups are based on the highest degree of students' parents, classified according to the International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED, see box 3.1),

- Students with higher education background have parents of which at least one has attained a higher education degree (ISCED 1997 level 5–6). In terms of ISCED 2011, this means that at least one of these students' parents has successfully completed a short cycle tertiary degree (level 5), a Bachelor's (level 6) or Master's degree (level 7), or a doctorate (level 8)<sup>1</sup>.
- Students without higher education background have parents whose highest educational degree is no higher than ISCED 1997/2011 level 4 (post-secondary non-tertiary education).

<sup>1</sup> or national equivalents



- For some analyses, three groups will be differentiated: students with high education backgrounds (ISCED 1997 level 5–6/ISCED 2011 level 5–8), students with medium education background (ISCED 1997/2011 level 3–4), and students from low education backgrounds (ISCED 1997/2011 level 0–2).

### Calculating representation indices

The share of students from a certain background in itself does not give any indication of how well represented the respective group is. Whether a certain amount of students is high or low can only be interpreted in relation to the general population of the same age. The question is, therefore, how well the student population represents the general population.

As an indicator for this representation, an index can be calculated. The index used in this chapter is based on characteristics of students' fathers, as the population statistics needed in the calculations regarding students' parents as a unit are not available. The index sets the share of students with fathers with a certain education background, e.g. without higher education, against the share of 40–59 year-old men with the same respective educational attainment in the population. The comparison group is chosen to represent the parent generation of students.

If the shares are equal, e.g., just as many students' fathers attended higher education as did 40–59 year-old men in the population, the index takes on the value of 1. This value indicates perfect participative equity with regard to the group in question. Values above 1 indicate that students with the education background in question are more common than would be expected based on the population (overrepresentation), values below 1 indicate underrepresentation.

### Strengths and limitations of EUROSTUDENT data

The type of index described above is advantageous in two ways. Firstly, its values are directly interpretable because they correspond to the norm of participative equity. Secondly, the index makes cross-country comparisons possible because it takes into account country-specific differences in overall educational attainment. The representation index is therefore a useful tool for gaining a comparative overview of the state of participative equity in European higher education.

Despite these advantages, it should be kept in mind that the index has limitations. For one thing, it draws on information on potential or hypothetical fathers and mothers of students in the population rather than directly using shares of young people from specific education backgrounds for comparison. This is simply due to the fact that such data are not available for most of the EUROSTUDENT countries. Still, the assumption that 40–59 year-olds best represent students' fathers, along with the assumption that adults of all education backgrounds have the same number of children at about the same time in their lives, is of course a possible biasing factor that may hold true to differing extent in the different EUROSTUDENT countries (see Mühleck, 2010).

A further issue not taken into account by the index is the share of international students in the national student populations. This may bias the index, depending on the size and composition of the groups of international students.

Furthermore, the index does not account for possible horizontal inequalities (Reimer & Pollak, 2010; Lucas, 2001). Differences between social groups *within* the higher education system, e.g. with regard to institution, degree or subject chosen, do not become apparent. In order to investigate these, the shares of students from different higher education backgrounds will be compared directly (see also >Chapter 10 for horizontal inequalities with regard to mobility).

Finally, as is the case with most indicators, data presented in this chapter can only show the status quo in higher education. It does not include information on the reasons for under- or overrepresentation. A value indicating “low representation” of a specific group could point to difficulties within the HE system, for example with regard to financing of studies, it could, however, also be due to students without higher education background leaving the school system early and not gaining the necessary qualification(s) for higher education entry. Further country-specific information is therefore needed in order to fully understand the factors that underlay the state of the higher education system.

EUROSTUDENT data are especially helpful in this regard as they enable the differentiation between students with and without higher education background through a wide range of topics. For most topics covered by the EUROSTUDENT survey, data differentiated by these two focus groups are available (>DRM) and will be analysed in this report’s chapters. This presents a wealth of data on students’ education background that is not available in similar form anywhere else, marking a great strength of the EUROSTUDENT data set.

### Notes on national surveys

In several national surveys, there were difficulties with matching parents’ degrees – which were usually attained several decades ago – to ISCED categories. For an in-depth examination of any one country’s data, note should be taken of the country comments in the >DRM, where any difficulties and country-specific solutions are explained. For the present chapter, however, the rather broad categories used for analysis are suitable and comparable across countries (Box 1).

**Germany:** The data presented for Germany in this chapter deviate from the focus groups “students with/without HE background” in the rest of the report. In the rest of the report, the focus groups are calculated according to the definition used for the German national report “Sozialerhebung”. This definition, in contrast to the EUROSTUDENT definition, is based on the type of education institutions students’ parents visited. According to this definition – and in line with the national understanding of higher education – students with HE background are defined as having at least one parent with a degree attained at a university or university of applied sciences (“Universität” or “Fachhochschule”), typically at ISCED 2011 level 6, 7, or 8. Students with parents who attained a degree at a non-academic institution (Fach-, Meister-, Technikerschule, Berufs- or Fachakademie) are – in the rest of the report – counted as “without HE background”. However, in this chapter, German data are analysed according to the EUROSTUDENT Conventions described above, i.e. according to ISCED 2011 levels. Therefore, students whose parents acquired an educational degree of level 5 or 6 at a non-academic institution are defined as having a HE background in this chapter.

## Data and interpretation

### Education background of students

*High shares of students without HE background can be found in Malta and Italy, high shares of students with HE background in Germany, Armenia, Denmark and Georgia*

In 12 EUROSTUDENT countries, more than half of all students have parents without higher education background (Figure 3.1).

- The majority of students come from families with no higher education background in Malta, Italy, Romania, Austria, Norway, Slovakia, Serbia, Croatia, Poland, Ireland, Czech Republic, and Bosnia-Herzegovina. Malta and Italy have especially high shares of students from this background – in these countries, their share is higher than 70%.
- In the remaining EUROSTUDENT countries, more than half of the students' parents have attained higher education degrees themselves. Especially Germany, Armenia, Denmark and Georgia have large shares of students with parents possessing higher education degrees. In these four countries, at least 70% of students' parents hold higher education degrees.
- The share of students with parents whose highest educational attainment is no higher than lower secondary school is lower than 10% in most countries. Malta, Italy, Ireland, Czech Republic and the Netherlands, with shares between 13% and 54%, are the only exceptions.

*Roughly the same pattern is apparent for fathers' and mothers' educational attainment*

Looking at the educational attainment of students' fathers, the same country groupings are apparent (Table A3.1).

- The same four countries have the highest shares of students with fathers holding a higher education degree (Armenia, Germany, Denmark, Georgia), and Italy and Malta, now together with Austria, Poland and Slovakia, have high shares (over 70%) of students' with fathers without higher education experience.
- Higher shares of students' fathers with educational attainment between ISCED level 0–2 are apparent than for both parents together: In Austria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Ireland, Italy, Lithuania, Latvia, Malta, the Netherlands, Norway, and Sweden, at least 10% of students have fathers whose highest degree is no higher than lower secondary school. In the Czech Republic, Ireland, Italy and Malta, this pertains to more than 20% of the student body.

In general, the educational attainment of students' mothers follows roughly the same overall pattern (Table A3.1).

### Educational choices of students without higher education background

Do students without higher education background study differently than do their counterparts with higher education background? The EUROSTUDENT data indicate that differences can in fact be identified.

*Students without HE background enter higher education later and tend to be older*


Firstly, students without higher education background enter higher education later. In almost 90% of EUROSTUDENT countries, the share of students without HE background is higher among delayed transition students than among all students (Table A3.2). In 17 countries, the difference in shares is at least 10 percentage points.

- In seven countries, the share of students without higher education background is at least 20 percentage points higher among delayed transition students (Austria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Croatia, Lithuania, Russia, and Slovenia).

Figure 3.1

## Educational attainment of students' parents

Share of students (in %)



Data source: EUROSTUDENT V, D.2.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 6.1 What is the highest level of education your father and mother have obtained? (indicated separately)

Notes: Per student, the highest educational attainment of either the father or the mother is counted.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: DE, GE, IT.

- In Denmark, Georgia, and Montenegro the pattern cannot be found, with students without higher education background being just as or even more common among all students as among delayed transition students.

The later entry into higher education is associated with a higher average age of students without higher education background. In 75 % of EUROSTUDENT countries, students without HE background are at least a year older than their counterparts (>Chapter 4, Table A4.2). In some countries, most notably the Nordic ones, the difference between the two groups amounts up to more than four years.

The second difference between students with and without higher education background pertains to the type of HEI chosen. In over 85 % of EUROSTUDENT countries with available data, the share of students without HE background is higher at non-universities than at universities (Table A3.2). In the majority of cases, the differences between universities and non-universities with regard to the share of students without higher education background are larger than 10 percentage points.

- Only in Bosnia-Herzegovina, France, and Hungary is the share of students without HE background at least slightly higher at universities.

To a lesser degree, differences are also apparent with regard to the choice of type of study programme (Table A3.2). Students with and without HE background are present to different degrees at the different levels of higher education: In half of the EUROSTUDENT countries, the share of students without higher education degrees is at least five percentage points higher in BA programmes than in MA programmes. This suggests that the break between BA and MA programmes might influence students with and without higher education background differently, with students without HE background tending to leave the higher education system after the first degree.

- The differences between BA and MA programmes are smaller than those between different types of HEI, though – only in four countries are the differences larger than 10 percentage points (Czech Republic, Georgia, the Netherlands, and Russia).
- In Malta, Romania, Serbia, and Slovenia, however, this pattern is reversed. In these four countries, students without higher education background are more often found among MA students than among BA students.

Regarding the choice of subject, students without higher education background show a definite preference for engineering subjects over the humanities in 10 EUROSTUDENT countries (Table A3.2).

- At least five percentage points more students without higher education background are enrolled in an engineering subject as opposed to a humanities subject in Estonia, Finland, Hungary, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Serbia, Sweden, and Slovenia.
- Only in Armenia, Georgia, Italy, Latvia and Malta is the relationship markedly different, with at least five percentage points more students without higher education background enrolled in a humanities subject than in engineering.

### HE participation of students without higher education background

Up to this point, the shares of students with and without higher education background have been analysed directly. In order to investigate how well students without higher education backgrounds are represented in higher education institutions in the EUROSTUDENT countries, Figure 3.2 sets the share of 40–59 year-old men in the population without a higher education degree (horizontal axis) against the share of students without (father's) higher education background (vertical axis)<sup>2</sup>.

**Students without HE background are underrepresented in almost all countries**


Almost all data points lie below the diagonal (grey line), indicating that the share of 40–59 year-old men in the population without a higher education degree is higher than among students' fathers in almost all countries. The only country in which students without (father's) HE background are slightly overrepresented is Norway. Although all other countries show some degree of underrepresentation with regard to students' fathers' education background, differences between countries can be made out.

- In Austria, Ireland, Italy, Malta, and Norway, students without HE background are especially well represented, as evidenced by index values greater than 0.90.
- In Armenia, Germany, and Denmark, the index values lie below 0.66, indicating that less than two thirds as many students without HE background (by fathers' education) are enrolled in HE as there are potential fathers without HE background in the population.
- In Austria, Switzerland, and Finland, the index is likely to be biased slightly downwards, underestimating the participation of students without higher education background. In these countries, more than 10 % of the students are international students, and the absolute differences between the higher education background of all students and international students are especially large (> 10 %, > DRM), with international students more often having a higher education background than national students.

<sup>2</sup> Data on students' fathers are used as no population data on parents education (as a unit) is available (see section „Calculating representation indices“).

Figure 3.2

## Representation of students without higher education background (based on fathers' educational attainment)



**Data source:** Educational attainment of students' fathers: EUROSTUDENT V, D.2. Educational attainment of men aged 40–59 in the population: AT, CH, CZ, DE, DK, EE, FI, FR, HR, HU, IE, IT, LT, LV, MT, NL, NO, PL, RO, SE, SI, SK: Labour Force Survey in the respective survey year. AM: Caucasus Barometer 2013. RU: National Census of Russia 2010. **No population data:** BA, GE, ME, RS, UA.

**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 6.1 What is the highest level of education your father and mother have obtained? [indicated separately]

**Notes:** The graph compares the share of students' fathers who have not attained higher education with the corresponding share of 40–59 year-old men in the national population (AM, RU: 40–60 year-olds). Shares of equal size result in a position on the diagonal (index value = 1). An index value of 1 indicates that there are exactly as many students from non-HE backgrounds as would be expected based on the distribution of educational attainment in the population. Values over 1 indicate overrepresentation of this group and lie above the diagonal, values below 1 and below the diagonal indicate underrepresentation.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

Nevertheless, underrepresentation of students without higher education background is apparent in almost all EUROSTUDENT countries. Not apparent in Figure 3.2, however, are any potential differences between different groups among students without higher education background. This group comprises students with parents having attained no formal education at all as well as students with parents whose highest degree stems from post-secondary, non-tertiary education. Figure 3.3 investigates further whether the underrepresentation of students without higher education background varies according to the type of degree students' fathers possess. Three groups are distinguished: Again, students with higher education background refer to students whose fathers have attained higher education. Students from medium education background refer to students whose fathers have an education at ISCED level 3 or 4. "Low education background" comprises those students whose fathers have not attained any qualification beyond lower secondary schooling.

As Figure 3.3 shows, several patterns can be identified with regard to these educational groups among the EUROSTUDENT countries.


- The first group of seven countries shows an overrepresentation of students with low education background (ISCED 0–2). Students with low education background are found more commonly than would be expected in Armenia, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Ireland, and, to a lesser degree, in Finland and Malta. All of these countries are characterized by an overrepresentation of students from both low and high education backgrounds – at the cost of students from medium education background, who are underrepresented in these countries.

*In some countries, the medium rather than the low education group is underrepresented*



Figure 3.3

Representation of students from high, medium and low educational backgrounds  
(based on fathers' educational attainment)



**Data source:** Educational attainment of students' fathers: EUROSTUDENT V, D.2. Educational attainment of men aged 40–59 in the population: AT, CH, CZ, DE, DK, EE, FI, FR, HR, HU, IE, IT, LT, LV, MT, NL, NO, PL, RO, SE, SI, SK: Labour Force Survey in the respective survey year. AM: Caucasus Barometer 2013. RU: National Census of Russia 2010. **No data:** CZ. **No population data:** BA, GE, ME, RS, UA.

**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 6.1 What is the highest level of education your father and mother have obtained?[indicated separately]

**Notes:** The graph depicts index values based on the share of students' fathers with a certain educational attainment with the corresponding share of 40–59 year-old men in the national population (AM, RU: 40–60 year-olds). Shares of equal size result in an index value of 1. An index value of 1 indicates that there are exactly as many students from a certain background as would be expected based on the distribution of educational attainment in the population. Values over 1 indicate overrepresentation of this group, values below 1 underrepresentation.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

- In all other EUROSTUDENT countries, students from low education backgrounds are – if slightly – underrepresented. In fact, in the majority of countries, students from low education background are the group that is more strongly underrepresented than students from medium education background. Slovenia, Romania, Poland, Germany, Croatia, Russia, Hungary and Slovakia have especially low shares of this student group in comparison to their respective populations, with at most half as many students stemming from low education backgrounds as one would expect. Additionally, in these countries, students with higher education backgrounds are often strongly overrepresented.
- The student populations in Norway, Switzerland, Austria, and the Netherlands are relatively representative of the population with regard to students' education background. While the higher educational group is also overrepresented in all of these countries except Norway, the index values for the other (low and medium) educational groups do not fall below 0.75 and thus indicate that these groups are relatively well-represented in the student body.

## Discussion and policy considerations

Students without HE background were at the centre of investigation in this chapter. It became apparent that this group is of quite different size in the different countries, making up between one and three quarters of the student population. Students without higher education background differ from their peers in several respects: In many coun-

tries, this group is especially distinguished by a later entry to higher education and a higher age. Additionally, the share of students without higher education background is higher at non-universities in most countries, confirming previous results on choices with regard to HEI type of students without higher education background (Arum et al., 2007; Reimer & Pollak, 2011). Results pertaining to students without higher education background in other chapters should be interpreted in light of these findings.

From an equity perspective, the results in this chapter show that a state of participative equity – defined as proportional representation of all education backgrounds – has not (yet) been reached in most EUROSTUDENT countries. Students without HE background are still underrepresented in almost all countries. This is in line with findings in the last EUROSTUDENT report (Orr, Gwosć, & Netz, 2011) as well as earlier investigations on the state of equity in European higher education (Camilleri & Mühleck, 2010). A more detailed investigation of the educational groups, differentiating between low and medium educational attainment of parents, showed that students from the lowest education background are in fact overrepresented in about a third of countries. In these and some other countries, it is the medium education background group, i.e. children of parents with educational attainment at ISCED level 3–4, who are underrepresented.

In summary, this chapter showed that students without higher education background are a group that is still taking part in an unequal manner in higher education, not only in a quantitative sense, but also in a qualitatively different manner. However, the analyses in this chapter do not tell us anything about the reasons for the differences and underrepresentation found. It should be kept in mind that the limited participation of students without higher education background shown in this chapter may not be a result of higher education policy, but can have its roots in processes taking place much earlier. Students without higher education background may not even (attempt to) gain an entrance qualification to higher education, so that the question of whether to enter higher education or not is not relevant. One possibility of increasing participation of students who did not gain a higher education entrance qualification when leaving the school system are thus special access courses or accreditation of prior learning (>Chapter 2), which offer the possibility to enter higher education at a later point. However, in some countries, interventions aiming at increasing the rate of higher education participation among students without higher education background might be even more promising when taking place much earlier in the educational career, thus increasing the number of students without higher education background gaining a higher education entrance qualification when leaving the school system (Neugebauer & Schindler, 2012).

The qualitatively different study choices and experiences that are described in this and the following chapters, however, pertain directly to students' life circumstances and study experiences and can be influenced by both higher education institutions as well as higher education policy. This report provides insights into how students without higher education background differ from students whose parents have attained HE with regard to a wide range of topics, from finance-related issues (>Chapter 7, >Chapter 8) over employment and time budget (>Chapter 5) to mobility (>Chapter 10), among others. Understanding in what ways students without higher education background differ from their peers will be the key to designing effective policy measures to support them in accessing and completing all kinds of studies at all kinds of HEIs.



# Tables

Table A3.1

## Highest educational attainment of students' parents, mothers, and fathers

Share of students (in %)

Country	Both parents			Fathers			Mothers		
	Up to lower secondary (ISCED 0–2)	Without HE background (ISCED 0–4)	With HE background (ISCED 5–8)	Up to lower secondary (ISCED 0–2)	Without HE background (ISCED 0–4)	With HE background (ISCED 5–8)	Up to lower secondary (ISCED 0–2)	Without HE background (ISCED 0–4)	With HE background (ISCED 5–8)
AM	3	27	73	3	27	73	2	24	76
AT	5	67	33	10	71	29	14	82	18
BA	3	52	48	4	60	40	13	65	35
CH	6	42	58	9	45	55	12	65	36
CZ	12	52	48	29	62	38	20	65	35
DE	3	30	70	4	37	63	7	57	44
DK	7	26	74	16	41	59	13	34	66
EE	5	31	69	15	51	49	8	40	60
FI	9	34	66	19	49	51	14	45	55
FR	10	42	58	18	55	46	17	53	47
GE	0.3	26	74	1	39	61	1	35	66
HR	2	53	47	5	65	35	9	69	31
HU	2	44	56	4	63	37	5	52	48
IE	23	52	48	40	64	36	29	61	39
IT	17	72	28	28	80	20	27	82	18
LT	5	36	64	10	57	44	7	42	58
LV	6	35	65	17	61	39	8	40	60
ME	2	46	54	4	55	45	5	64	37
MT	54	72	28	65	78	22	70	86	14
NL	13	48	52	19	56	45	25	65	35
NO	17	63	37	17	67	33	17	58	42
PL	1	53	47	4	72	28	3	59	41
RO	8	68	32	8	67	33	8	69	31
RS	2	55	45	3	66	34	7	67	34
RU	1	32	68	4	46	54	2	39	61
SE	10	39	62	17	52	48	16	50	50
SI	4	44	56	9	59	41	10	55	45
SK	1	60	40	1	71	29	2	71	29
UA	0.4	34	66	2	51	49	1	43	57

Data source: EUROSTUDENT V, D.2.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 6.1 What is the highest level of education your father and mother have obtained? [indicated separately]

Notes: For highest educational attainment of students' parents, the highest educational attainment of either the father or the mother is counted.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: DE, GE, IT.

Table A3.2

**Students with and without higher education background by transition route, type of study programme, type of HEI, and field of study**

Share of students (in %)

Country	All students		Delayed Transition		Bachelor		Master		University		Non-university		Humanities		Engineering	
	With HE back-ground	Without HE back-ground	With HE back-ground	Without HE back-ground	With HE back-ground	Without HE back-ground	With HE back-ground	Without HE back-ground	With HE back-ground	Without HE back-ground	With HE back-ground	Without HE back-ground	With HE back-ground	Without HE back-ground	With HE back-ground	Without HE back-ground
AM	73	27	65	36	74	26	74	26	74	26	64	36	71	30	78	22
AT	33	67	13	87	32	68	31	69	36	64	20	81	35	65	32	68
BA	48	52	41	59	48	52	51	49	48	52	76	24	53	47	54	46
CH	58	42	48	52	57	43	63	37	64	36	50	50	61	39	64	36
CZ	48	52	27	73	45	55	56	44	49	51	38	62	49	51	50	50
DE	70	30	63	37	67	33	73	27	73	27	63	37	72	28	68	32
DK	74	26	76	24	74	26	81	20	78	22	70	30	76	24	75	25
EE	55	45	35	65	52	48	61	39	60	40	41	59	61	39	56	44
FI	66	34	55	45	63	37	71	29	72	28	58	42	68	32	62	38
FR	58	42	45	55	56	44	56	44	56	44	63	37	56	44	59	41
GE	75	25	81	19	74	27	83	17	75	25	–	–	69	31	77	23
HR	47	53	25	75	43	57	50	50	50	50	36	64	49	52	51	50
HU	56	44	38	62	53	47	56	44	55	45	58	42	61	39	53	48
IE	48	52	30	70	49	51	49	52	58	43	39	62	49	51	48	52
IT	28	72	15	85	24	76	30	70	28	72	–	–	26	74	31	69
LT	64	36	44	56	63	37	71	30	71	30	49	51	74	26	64	36
LV	65	35	56	44	66	34	69	31	66	34	64	36	63	37	68	32
ME	54	46	55	45	53	47	62	38	54	46	–	–	57	43	57	44
MT	28	72	•	•	33	67	27	73	28	72	24	76	29	71	37	63
NL	52	48	33	67	50	50	61	39	65	35	44	56	64	36	52	49
NO	64	36	–	–	63	37	71	29	70	30	59	41	69	31	67	33
PL	47	53	–	–	46	54	45	55	50	50	42	58	56	44	46	54
RO	40	61	29	71	41	59	35	65	40	61	–	–	54	47	29	71
RS	45	55	39	62	48	52	34	66	46	54	35	65	44	56	37	63
RU	54	46	31	69	53	47	65	35	55	45	38	62	55	46	54	46
SE	62	39	57	43	61	39	66	35	62	39	–	–	67	33	61	40
SI	56	44	33	67	56	44	47	53	59	41	35	65	63	37	54	46
SK	40	60	27	73	38	63	41	59	40	60	–	–	41	59	40	60
UA	66	34	54	46	64	36	73	27	68	32	65	35	68	33	66	34

– no data • too few cases

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, D.4, D.5.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 6.1 What is the highest level of education your father and mother have obtained? [indicated separately]**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.



## Chapter 4

# Characteristics of national student populations

### Key findings

- **Students' age:** Age is a major differentiating factor between student populations in EUROSTUDENT countries. Students' mean age varies between 20 years in the youngest and 29 years in the oldest country. Armenia, Georgia, Russia and Ukraine have the youngest student bodies, while the Nordic countries Finland, Norway, and Sweden have especially high shares of students aged 25 and older.
- **Students with children:** The share of students with children is very different across the EUROSTUDENT countries. Overall, older students tend to have children more often than younger students do. The highest share of students with children can be found in Estonia, Norway, and Sweden, where at least 20 % of students have one or more children. The majority of students' children is under six years old in almost 80 % of countries.
- **Gender balance:** In almost all countries, the majority of students are women. Only in Germany and Ireland is the share of female students below 50 %. Women also make up a larger part of students without higher education background in three quarters of EUROSTUDENT countries. Especially large shares of women can be found in humanities subjects as opposed to engineering subjects. The share of females is at least 13 percentage points higher in the former, indicating that gender is related to subject of study in all EUROSTUDENT countries.
- **Students with migration background:** In two thirds of the EUROSTUDENT countries, the share of 2<sup>nd</sup> generation migrants does not exceed 10 %. Switzerland, Montenegro, Germany, Estonia, Croatia, and Ukraine, with shares above 15 %, are the six EUROSTUDENT countries with the highest share of 2<sup>nd</sup> generation migrant students. The five countries with the lowest share of 2<sup>nd</sup> generation migrants are Finland, Hungary, Romania, Poland, and Georgia. In these countries, no more than 2 % of students are 2<sup>nd</sup> generation migrants.
- **Students with impairments:** In three quarters of the EUROSTUDENT countries, no more than 5 % of students report that any health impairments they may have present (quite) a big obstacle. In about half of the EUROSTUDENT countries, the most widespread impairments are chronic diseases which in these countries afflict between 3 % and 16 % of the students.

## Main issues

The student body in (not only) European higher education has undergone significant changes over the past decades. In many countries, expansion of higher education has led to increased diversification of the student population. This chapter will take a look at the student populations in the different countries with a special focus on non-traditional students.

### Diverse student populations

With increasing diversity of the students entering higher education, the term “non-traditional students” has been coined, referring to students who deviate in some way from the majority of students previously making up the student body. What exactly makes a student “non-traditional” has been defined in different ways; however, the term is often applied to students who fulfill one or several of the following criteria (Kim, 2002; Madhani, 2012; Orr, 2010, 2012):

- Different with regard to socio-demographic characteristics, i.e. older students (age 25+) and women.
- Different life circumstances: Students who have dependents other than a spouse, are single parents, do not have a higher education entrance qualification, or students with impairments.
- Different social background characteristics: students without higher education background (>Chapter 3), migrant students, and students from low socio-economic backgrounds.

Further indicators distinguishing non-traditional students from their peers that have been discussed include a delayed entry into higher education (>Chapter 2), studying part-time (>Chapter 5), being financially independent of parents (>Chapter 7), and working full-time (>Chapter 6).

Looking at the number of indicators that have been associated with the term “non-traditional student”, it becomes apparent that on the one hand, it is unlikely that only one at a time will apply to a student, on the other hand, it is likely that at least one will apply. In other words, many students will be “non-traditional” in one way or the other. An awareness of this diversity of students is important for policy-makers and HEIs in order to develop appropriate support mechanisms which effectively serve the needs of the different groups.

This chapter will therefore explore how diverse the student body in European countries is with regard to selected socio-demographic characteristics, life circumstances, and migration background. Key questions are:

- What is the age profile of students in the different countries?
- How many students have children?
- What is the gender balance in the EUROSTUDENT countries? Are differences apparent with regard to levels of education, subjects or HEI type?
- How many students have a migration background?
- How many students have impairments relevant to the pursuit of their studies?

## Methodological and conceptual notes

This chapter describes national student populations with regard to age, students with children, gender, students with migration background, and students with impairments. As all EUROSTUDENT data, the numbers reported are based on students' self-reports.

### Students with children

Students with children are a special student group as they are usually under an additional burden of having to care for their children. This may leave them with less time and resources to devote towards their studies than their childless counterparts. The EUROSTUDENT core questionnaire stipulates that students are to be asked to indicate whether they have any children, if so, how many, as well as the age of their youngest child. No specifications with regard to biological relatedness or place of residency of potential children are made. Responses may therefore include biological children of students who are not living with their parents as well as any kind of children who depend on the student in social and economic ways, e.g. adopted children, stepchildren, foster children, the partner's children, etc.

### Students with impairments

Chronic disease, physical disabilities or other kinds of health problems may impair students in taking up or completing studies. In many countries, policy or national law stipulates that prospective students should not be deterred from entering or completing their studies due to disabilities, in particular, physical disabilities. Students with severe health problems may be more likely to require counseling and support during their studies than their counterparts.

The data presented in this chapter are based on the self-assessment of students. Students were asked to indicate whether they have “a disability, long standing health problems or functional limitation”. The answer specified which impairment(s) the student has: chronic diseases, mental health problems, mobility impairments, sensory impairments (vision or hearing), learning disability (ADHD, dyslexia), and/or other long standing health problems categories (multiple responses possible). In a second step, students who had indicated any impairments were asked to rate to what extent these present an obstacle to their studies.

As countries have very different traditions of defining what constitutes a disability or impairment, comparability between countries is limited. It is questionable whether students in the different EUROSTUDENT countries share a common understanding of impairments. The analysis in this chapter is therefore focused on students who indicated that their impairment was (quite) a big obstacle to their studies (Figure 4.6), regardless of the type of impairment. For within-country analyses, the more detailed data might prove valuable (> [DRM](#)).

### Migration background

The term “migration background” is used to refer to students who have a history of migration either themselves or in their immediate family. With regard to higher education, students with migration background may have different or additional needs as

compared to their peers. Griga (2013) names language, social background, educational aspirations, legal status, and gender as the key factors in which students with migration background may differ from their peers from an educational sociology point of view. All of these factors may (negatively) influence study choice, entry, and progress of students with migration background<sup>1</sup>. While language and legal status in all probability have more relevance to students who migrated themselves, i.e. were born in a country different from the one they are undertaking their studies in, social background, educational aspirations, and gender roles may also influence students who did not migrate themselves but come from a family in which at least one parent was born in a different country.

The definition of the concept “migration background” in the EUROSTUDENT project takes into account the place of birth of students and that of their parents. The different migration states are defined as follows:

- **2<sup>nd</sup> generation migrant:** At least one parent was born abroad and the student was born in the country of the survey;
- **1<sup>st</sup> generation migrant:** At least one parent and the student were born abroad;
- **domestic student:** Both parents and the student were born in the country of the survey;
- **other:** Both parents were born in the country of the survey and the student was born abroad.

This definition entails that the groups of “1<sup>st</sup> generation migrants” will be made up to a large part of international students, who are, according to EUROSTUDENT Conventions, classified according to their first school leaving qualification. For this reason, the analysis will mainly focus on 2<sup>nd</sup> generation migrant students.

### Strengths and shortcomings of EUROSTUDENT data

As the EUROSTUDENT national surveys will not always capture a perfectly representative sample of the respective student population, statistics regarding age and gender may be more accurate when based on administrative data, e.g. from Eurostat. Despite this caveat, our data can be expected to highlight the same pattern of results. Moreover, some data presented in this chapter are not captured in many national statistics systems. This holds true especially for data regarding students with children, age of students’ children, and students with impairments, and is a great advantage of the EUROSTUDENT data set. Additionally, the EUROSTUDENT data set allows for a differentiated analysis of the different focus groups (>Chapter 1, >DRM), which is hardly possible with any other data source.

### Notes on national surveys

There are some differences with regard to the questions concerning students’ impairments in the national surveys.

- **Austria:** Students were asked in two steps to answer first whether they have any impairment, and were then asked to give details on the kind of impairment or chronic disease (with the option to state „I do not want to give further information“).

<sup>1</sup> Furthermore, different ethnic minority groups within a country may differ from each other (see, e.g. Jackson, Jonsson, & Rudolphi, 2012). These differences are not investigated in this publication.

- **Germany:** The German questionnaire contains a filter question: 1. Do you have any health impairments? 2. If yes: Which kind of health impairment do you have? Respondents who report health impairments but do not indicate which kind are counted as missings. The obstacle question also contains a filter question: 1. Are your impairments an obstacle to your studies? 2. If yes: To what extent? The extent of study-related health impairment was measured with a five-point Likert-type scale. The answer „no“ in Question 1, which led to a missing value in the scale of Question 2, was recoded as „small/no obstacle“.
- **The Netherlands:** The initial question in the national questionnaire contained more categories of impairment.

## Data and interpretation

### Students' age


- Overall, students in the EUROSTUDENT countries are relatively young. In about two thirds of the EUROSTUDENT countries, more than two out of three students are under the age of 25 (Figure 4.1). The share of older students, however, varies greatly between countries.
- Ukraine, Georgia, Russia, and Armenia have the youngest student bodies. Less than 10 % of students are 25 years old or older in these countries. This finding is reflected in the lowest mean ages of all countries – students are on average 20 or 21 years old. In these four countries with the youngest student population, students typically enter higher education at a relatively young age.
- Slightly higher shares of students who are 25 years old or older – between 10 % and 20 % – can be found in France, Latvia, Romania, Slovakia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Poland, Serbia, and Slovenia. More than 20 %, but less than 30 % of students are over

*In 2/3 of EUROSTUDENT countries, more than 2 in 3 students are younger than 25 years*

Figure 4.1

#### Age profile of students

Share of students (in %) and mean age



Data source: EUROSTUDENT V, A.1.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 5.1 When were you born?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: DE, GE, IT.



the age of 24 in Croatia, Lithuania, Italy, the Netherlands, Montenegro, Hungary, and the Czech Republic. In the remaining countries, at least every third student is 25 years old or older.

- Among these countries, Norway, Sweden, and Finland have especially high shares of students aged 25 and up. In these three Nordic countries, more than half of the students fall into this age category. In fact, at least every fourth student in these countries is at least 30 years old (Table A4.1). Accordingly, the mean ages in these countries are the highest at 28 (Finland) and 29 years (Sweden and Norway). The large shares of older students in the Nordic countries may be due to students without higher education background entering or returning to higher education at an older age (as is typical, >Chapter 3) – in these countries, students without higher education background are on average at least four years older than students with higher education background (Table A4.2).

## Dependents

Older students are not different from younger students due to their age per se. Differences in study behavior are mainly due to the different life situations these students find themselves in. One factor that influences the study experience is whether a student has to care and/or provide for any children. As Figure 4.2 shows, the share of students with children is very different across the EUROSTUDENT countries.


**The older the student population, the more students have children**

In two thirds of EUROSTUDENT countries, no more than 10% of students have children. The highest share of students with children can be found in Norway, Sweden, and Estonia, where at least 20% of students have at least one child. In the Czech Republic, Germany, Russia, Armenia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, France, Italy, and Georgia, this share is less than 5%.

Figure 4.2

### Students with children by age of youngest child and mean age of students

Share of students (in %) and mean age



**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, A.1, A.7. **No data:** Children's age: IT.


**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 5.5 Do you have any children, if yes how many? 5.6 How old is your youngest child?

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

Figure 4.3

## Students with children by age group

Share of students (in %)



**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, A.7, A.8. **Too few cases:** Students 25–29 years: UA; Students 30 years and older: GE, UA.

**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 5.5 Do you have any children, if yes how many?

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

The percentage of students with children is related to the mean age of students – the older the population is on average, the more students have children (Figure 4.2). Figure 4.3 shows this relationship in more detail for the different age groups. It is apparent that the largest shares of students with children can be found among students 25 years old and older. In all countries except Poland, Germany, and Switzerland, at least every third student 30 years old and older has children. In Norway, Sweden, Estonia, Lithuania, Slovakia, and Russia, more than two third of these students aged 30 or older have children. Among younger students in the age groups up to 21 and 22–24 years old, at most 10% have children across all countries, with most countries registering significantly below this value.

Overall, students' children tend to be relatively young (Figure 4.2). In almost 80% of countries, the majority of students' children are under six years old. Larger shares of children over six tend to be found in countries with an older student population.

### Gender balance

■ In almost all countries, the majority of students are women. Only in Germany and Ireland is the share of female students below 50%. From Bachelor to Master programmes, the share of females increases at least slightly in two thirds of the countries. Estonia, Latvia, Poland, and Armenia register shares between five and 20 percentage points higher in MA than in BA programmes. In Russia, Norway, Sweden, and Austria, however, the share of women decreases by at least five percentage points between BA and MA programmes.


■ Subject choice is related to gender in many countries (Table A4.3). In all EUROSTUDENT countries, the share of females in humanities subjects is at least 13 percentage points higher than the share of female students in engineering subjects. In Latvia, Ukraine, Georgia, and Denmark, the share of females in humanities programmes is

*Women are the majority in almost all countries and types of degrees*

*Strong relationships are apparent between gender and subject choice*

Figure 4.4

## Share of female students by type of study programme



Data source: EUROSTUDENT V, A.4.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 5.2 What is your sex?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: DE, GE, IT.

at least 50 percentage points higher than in engineering programmes. The difference is smallest in Slovakia and Romania, with a difference of 21 percentage points or less.

- In Bosnia-Herzegovina, Germany, France, Croatia, Ireland, Lithuania, Malta, Slovenia, and Ukraine, the share of women is between five and 18 percentage points higher at universities as opposed to non-universities (Table A4.3). In Hungary, Norway and Russia, on the contrary, larger shares of women can be found at non-universities (more than five percentage points difference). In the rest of the countries, the distribution by gender across HEI type is fairly even.
- In three quarters of EUROSTUDENT countries, women make up a larger part of students without higher education background (Table A4.3). Only in Denmark, Ireland, Montenegro, and Malta are more women among students with higher education background than among students without higher education background. In Germany and the Netherlands, no difference in the share of female students is apparent between students with and without higher education background.

### Migration background of students


Switzerland, Montenegro, Germany, Estonia, Croatia, and Ukraine have the highest share of 2<sup>nd</sup> generation migrant students

- In two thirds of the EUROSTUDENT countries, the share of 2<sup>nd</sup> generation migrants does not exceed 10%. Switzerland, Montenegro, Germany, Estonia, Croatia, and Ukraine are the six EUROSTUDENT countries with the highest share of 2<sup>nd</sup> generation migrant students (Figure 4.5). In these countries, at least 15 % of students were born in the country of survey, but have at least one parent born abroad.
- The five countries with the lowest share of 2<sup>nd</sup> generation migrants are Romania, Hungary, Finland, Poland, and Georgia. In these countries, no more than 2 % of students are 2<sup>nd</sup> generation migrants.
- It is striking that Switzerland, Sweden, Denmark, and Finland have higher shares of 1<sup>st</sup> generation migrants. At least every fifth student in these countries was born

Figure 4.5

## Migration background of students

Share of students (in %)



Data source: EUROSTUDENT V, A.15. No data: FR, IT.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 5.3 In which country were you and your parents (or those who raised you) born?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: DE, GE, IT.

abroad and has at least one parent who was born abroad. Many of these students are international students, i.e. students who left the school system for the first time in another country rather than students who migrated as children and attained a national qualification (>DRM).

## Students with impairments

In about three quarters of the EUROSTUDENT countries, no more than 5 % of all students report that any health impairments they may have presents a (quite) big obstacle (Figure 4.6). In the Netherlands, France, Lithuania, Ireland, Denmark, and Austria, this share is somewhat higher, with between 6 % and 13 % of students reporting to have health impairments that negatively affect their studies. It should be noted, however, that the Dutch questionnaire offered more categories of impairment than the EUROSTUDENT core questionnaire, which might explain the higher shares of students with impairments.


**No more than 5 % students with health impairments in three out of four EUROSTUDENT countries**

- In all countries, the share of students acquiescing when asked whether any disabilities, long-standing health problems or functional limitations are present is at least twice as high as that of students perceiving any impairments to be (quite) a big obstacle in all countries. However, these shares are reduced to quite differing extent when students are asked to indicate the severity of the impairment, i.e. to what extent it presents an obstacle to their studies. This pattern indicates that the original question “do you have a disability [...]” seems to evoke quite different ideas about what represents an impairment in the different EUROSTUDENT countries.
- In about half of the EUROSTUDENT countries, the most widespread impairments are chronic diseases, which in these countries afflict between 3 % and 16 % of the students (>DRM). “Other long standing health impairments” were also common, being the most often indicated impairment in a further six EUROSTUDENT countries. Sensory impairments and mental health issues were the most widespread

Figure 4.6

**Students with impairments by self-assessed severity of impairments**

Share of students (in %)

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, A.10, A.13. **No data:** CH, IT.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 5.7 Please indicate if you have a disability, long standing health problems or functional limitations. 5.8 Overall, to what extent are your impairments an obstacle to your studies? [only students with impairments in 5.7]**Notes:** "students with impairments, perceiving them as (quite) big obstacle" combines the first two answer categories of a five-point scale from "big obstacle" to "no obstacle".**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** AT, DE, NL.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

impairments in five and four countries, respectively. Only few students indicated that they had mobility impairments – this share does not exceed 3 % in any country. Learning disabilities are also not common among students in EUROSTUDENT countries. Only in a quarter of all countries does the share of students with a learning disability exceed 3 %: Netherlands, Ireland, Norway, Finland, Sweden, Estonia and Czech Republic (>DRM).

## Discussion and policy considerations

The results presented in this chapter highlight the fact that a student in one EUROSTUDENT country may be very different from a student in another. At the same time, two students in the same country may have very different life circumstances and backgrounds.

Large differences between as well as within countries exist with regard to students' age. The pattern of results with regard to the median age of countries is overall in line with those presented by Eurostat (2012) for students in European countries. Especially high mean ages and large shares of students older than 25 can be found in the Nordic countries Norway, Finland, and Sweden, whereas the former Soviet Union member states Armenia, Georgia, Russia, and Ukraine, which took part in EUROSTUDENT for the first time, are characterised by homogeneously young students populations.

Related to the issue of age is that of students with children. The older the student population is on average, the more of the students are parents. Students' children are largely younger than six years old. This highlights the need for flexible study arrangements and childcare options for students who are parents, as most of them will not be able to rely on school as a caretaking mechanism.

The finding that women are in the majority in higher education in the EUROSTUDENT countries confirms that the often-cited “feminisation of higher education” since the mid-nineties (Buchmann, DiPrete, & McDaniel, 2008; McDaniel, 2012; Vincent-Lancrin, 2008) has well and truly taken place in most EUROSTUDENT countries. At the same time, gender segregation according to field of study still exists (see also Barone, 2011). Charles and Bradley (2009) posit that this segregation will not just naturally disappear now that women participate in higher education to the same or even higher extent than men, as the forces driving the two phenomena – access and subject choice – are different ones. Specifically, they see gendered self-perceptions at the root of differing study choices between men and women.

The EUROSTUDENT data on 2<sup>nd</sup> generation migrants and students with impairment further showcases the diversity of student populations showing again that in all countries students with attributes that make them different from the “traditional” student participate in higher education. What the presented data cannot depict, however, is these students' experiences. Such data might help to understand better any differences between countries with regard to how these students groups participate in higher education and to which degree they are supported by national or institutional initiatives (see Fuller et al., 2009; Griga, 2013). It might be worth considering making disabled students a focus group in future rounds in order to learn more about their experiences and learning at university, e.g. their time budget (see, e.g., Sachs & Schreuer, 2011). Unfortunately, measuring impairments both accurately and economically remains a challenge for cross-country comparative research (see also de Smedt & van den Berg, 2001).

In summary, this chapter highlights the diversity inherent in many student populations. Any policy measures at the national or institutional level should be designed with this diversity in mind in order to make sure that no students group is inadvertently excluded. Also, awareness of this diversity within the student population should be fostered among students themselves. Non-traditional students may have less success in their studies if they perceive themselves to be different from the typical student (Lane & Gibbons, 2007) and have few interactions with their fellow students (Gilardi & Guglielmetti, 2013).

# Tables

Table A4.1

## Age profile of students

Share of students (in %) and mean age, SD, and median age

Country	Younger than 22 years	At least 22 but younger than 25 years	At least 25 but younger than 30 years	At least 30 years	Mean age	SD	Median age
AM	74	17	4	4	21	4	20
AT	23	31	28	18	26	7	25
BA	39	42	16	3	23	3	23
CH	17	40	31	13	25	5	24
CZ	34	39	16	12	25	6	23
DE	25	40	27	8	24	4	23
DK	10	48	25	18	26	6	24
EE	25	32	24	19	26	7	24
FI	15	27	32	26	28	7	25
FR	63	23	9	5	22	5	21
GE	70	27	3	1	21	2	20
HR	47	32	14	7	23	4	22
HU	26	47	15	12	25	6	23
IE	43	18	11	28	27	10	23
IT	45	31	19	5	23	5	22
LT	52	27	11	10	24	5	22
LV	56	29	9	6	23	5	22
ME	35	38	15	11	24	5	23
MT	47	14	23	16	25	8	22
NL	44	31	14	11	24	7	22
NO	20	28	22	30	29	9	25
PL	42	39	13	6	23	4	23
RO	52	33	9	7	25	6	23
RS	41	39	14	7	24	5	23
RU	64	31	4	1	21	2	20
SE	20	28	26	27	29	10	25
SI	27	53	9	11	24	5	23
SK	50	32	9	8	24	5	22
UA	91	9	0.4	0.3	20	2	20

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, A.1.

**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 5.1 When were you born?

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

Table A4.2

**Age profile of students by educational background**

Mean age, SD, and median age

Country	With HE background			Without HE background		
	Mean age	SD	Median age	Mean age	SD	Median age
AM	21	4	20	22	4	21
AT	25	5	24	27	7	25
BA	23	3	22	23	3	23
CH	25	5	24	26	6	24
CZ	24	4	23	26	7	23
DE	24	4	23	24	5	23
DK	26	5	24	27	6	25
EE	25	5	24	27	7	25
FI	26	5	24	30	9	27
FR	21	4	20	22	6	21
GE	21	2	20	21	2	20
HR	23	4	22	24	5	22
HU	24	5	23	26	7	24
IE	25	7	22	28	10	24
IT	22	4	22	23	5	22
LT	23	5	22	24	6	22
LV	23	4	22	24	6	22
ME	24	5	23	24	5	23
MT	24	8	21	26	9	23
NL	23	6	22	25	8	23
NO	27	7	24	32	11	28
PL	23	3	23	24	4	22
RO	24	5	23	25	6	23
RS	24	4	23	24	5	23
RU	21	2	20	21	2	20
SE	27	9	25	32	11	27
SI	24	4	23	25	5	23
SK	23	4	22	24	6	22
UA	20	2	20	20	2	20

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, A.2.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 5.1 When were you born?**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.



Table A4.3

**Female students by field of study, type of higher education institution, and education background**

Share of students (in %)

Country	All students	Humanities	Engineering	University	Non-university	With HE background	Without HE background
AM	55	77	29	55	58	55	58
AT	54	67	27	54	55	53	55
BA	58	71	43	58	43	54	61
CH	52	61	22	51	54	51	54
CZ	57	66	30	57	56	55	59
DE	48	66	21	52	40	48	48
DK	55	70	20	57	54	57	51
EE	59	71	31	60	57	57	65
FI	54	65	16	54	53	53	56
FR	54	69	28	58	43	52	55
GE	56	83	20	56	–	54	63
HR	56	75	30	59	45	55	58
HU	55	64	22	53	62	52	58
IE	49	61	17	55	43	52	48
IT	57	74	32	57	–	51	59
LT	58	73	27	60	55	56	65
LV	59	75	19	60	57	56	65
ME	55	76	33	55	–	56	54
MT	55	70	24	58	44	61	58
NL	53	61	19	52	53	53	53
NO	61	63	28	58	63	58	65
PL	59	74	36	57	61	57	61
RO	59	63	42	59	–	62	63
RS	51	60	27	51	51	49	53
RU	65	79	43	64	75	63	70
SE	58	64	27	58	–	57	60
SI	58	70	24	59	52	54	62
SK	58	59	46	58	–	51	64
UA	58	79	27	71	53	57	61

– no data

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, A.4 & A.5.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 5.2 What is your sex?**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

## Chapter 5

# Types and modes of study

### Key findings

- **Students' enrolment in Bachelor programmes:** Around 70 % of students are enrolled in Bachelor study programmes on (unweighted) average across all EUROSTUDENT countries. In the majority of countries, the share of students enrolled in Bachelor programmes is greater among high intensity students than among low intensity students and among students without higher education background than among their peers with higher education background.
- **Students' enrolment in Master programmes:** Around one in five students is enrolled in a Master study programme across all EUROSTUDENT countries. In the majority of countries, the share of students enrolled in Master programmes is higher among low intensity students than among high intensity students. Also in two thirds of the countries, the share of students enrolled in Master programmes is greater among those with higher education background than among their counterparts without higher education background.
- **Students' enrolment in short-cycle higher education programmes and long national programmes:** In almost all EUROSTUDENT countries for which data are available, the share of students enrolled in short-cycle higher education programmes is higher among low intensity students, students without higher education background, and delayed transition students than among their respective counterparts. On the other hand, the share of students enrolled in long national programmes is relatively low among these groups in all of the countries.
- **Students' formal status of enrolment and study intensity:** In more than half of the EUROSTUDENT countries, at least 80 % of students are enrolled as full-time students. In five countries at least one in four students has a part-time status. In many countries, the formal status of students does not align completely with their actual study intensity: In six countries, at least 60 % of part-time students spend more than 21 hours per week on study-related activities.

## Main issues

The European higher education system and especially the 47 signatory states of the Bologna Declaration have witnessed significant degree and curriculum reforms in the recent years. The Bologna process has resulted in a considerable restructuring of study programmes in the majority of its signatory states with the goal to make higher education systems more compatible between countries and to promote mobility (Bologna Declaration, 1999). In view of these reforms, this chapter examines the enrolment pattern and the characteristics of students in different study programmes. An additional analysis examines the formal status of students, i.e. whether they are registered to study on a full-time or part-time basis. This analysis is based on the emphasis of the Bologna reforms on making study structures flexible to enable students, especially those who are working or second-chance learners, to balance their personal, professional, and educational activities.

### Degree and curriculum reforms

The key reforms in relation to the degree structures stem from the Bologna Declaration (1999). In order to make the higher education systems more compatible between countries in Europe and to facilitate student mobility, the Bologna framework proposed the adoption of a European system of higher education based on two main cycles, undergraduate and graduate, consisting of Bachelor and Master degrees, respectively (Bologna Declaration, 1999). Later, in the Berlin Communiqué (2003), doctoral studies were included as the third cycle in the reforms. In the same year, short-cycle higher education programmes and qualifications were also included within the Bologna framework.

According to the Bologna structure, a Bachelor degree generally requires completion of 180 to 240 credits<sup>1</sup>, spread over a period of three years. The credit requirements for a Master degree vary between 60 and 120 credits. Short-cycle higher education programmes typically refer to programmes requiring 120 credits (Bergen Communiqué, 2005). In addition, nearly all countries offer integrated/long national programmes for certain regulated professions which according to EU and/or national legislations require five to six years of studies. The study fields offered as long national programmes vary across countries, but they often include medicine, dentistry, veterinary studies, pharmacy, and architecture. In a few countries, study fields such as engineering, theology, architecture, and law are also offered as long national programmes (Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency, 2012).

In addition to making the study programmes comparable and compatible across member countries, the Bologna Agenda also intends to introduce 'flexible learning pathways' and 'student-centred learning'. In order to represent the 'diversity of the population' and for inclusion of underrepresented groups, flexibility in study programmes is considered necessary to help diverse student groups balance their education, professional, and personal demands. A few ways of achieving this are through the provision of part-time study programmes, distance education courses, short cycle programmes, and by breaking the workload into smaller units.

<sup>1</sup> The credits are specified in terms of the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS).

In view of the degree and curriculum reforms, this chapter describes the enrolment of students in study programmes according to the Bologna two-cycle structure, short-cycle higher education programmes, and long national programmes. This chapter also examines the flexibility of study structures in the EUROSTUDENT countries by looking at the share of students with full-time and part-time enrolment status.

### Selective enrolment in degree programmes

The reforms in the higher education systems present students with innumerable opportunities and choices, ranging from selecting study programmes to types of institutions and field of study. Different types of study programmes lead to different employment prospects, which may be more or less attractive to certain student groups. The short-cycle higher education programmes, because of their applied focus, particularly attract students from disadvantaged backgrounds, such as first generation students, ethnic minority groups, and adult learners (Kirsch, Beernaert, & Nørgaard, 2003). At the same time, courses in medicine, law, and veterinary science, which are mostly offered as long national programmes, have been found to attract students from high social backgrounds (Reimer & Pollak, 2010). Against this background, this chapter further examines the characteristics of students enrolled in various study programmes and fields of study.

## Methodological and conceptual notes

### Classification of study programmes and definition of students' formal enrolment

In examining students' enrolment patterns, three aspects are considered in this chapter. These include an examination of the share of students across various study programmes, fields of study, and the formal status of students' enrolment. In understanding students' enrolment across study programmes, the following four types of programmes are considered: Bachelor programmes, Master programmes, short-cycle higher education programmes, and long national programmes.

The formal status of students is assessed on the basis of their formal registration status, i.e. whether they are enrolled in the higher education programme on a full-time or a part-time basis. The classification as full-time and part-time students is independent of the number of hours actually spent on study-related activities (>Chapter 6). Therefore, it may not correlate completely with the actual intensity of the study programme. Systematic differences between student groups are investigated for all aspects of students' enrolment.

### Notes on national surveys

A small number of countries deviated marginally from the EUROSTUDENT survey conventions, which limits the international comparability of their data on a few indicators on students' enrolment.

- In Finland, students pursuing medical degrees are included in the Master programmes category as opposed to long national programmes.
- In Germany the category 'other post-graduate' was not offered as a response option in the survey. Therefore, in the case of Germany, the category 'other' may comprise both post-graduate and undergraduate students enrolled in 'other' programmes.

- It must also be noted that there is no official part-time enrolment status in Finland. Data on students' formal status of enrolment in Finland are based on students' self-assessment of their status and not on their formal registration status.
- In Denmark, Italy, and Latvia, national samples comprise only full-time students.
- Data from Austria are from the year 2011 and are therefore of limited international comparability with regard to students' enrolment in long national programmes.

### Strengths and shortcomings of EUROSTUDENT data

EUROSTUDENT data on types and modes of study capture how students in different countries are distributed across study programmes and fields of study. Administrative statistics on this may provide somewhat more reliable rates of participation. However, they do not enable the analyses of the types of students taking them up, certainly not in a comparative context. The main strength of the EUROSTUDENT data is that it allows for examining the distribution of students in different countries across study programmes and fields of study by sex, educational background, study intensity, type of higher education institution, age groups. Data on the enrolment of students in the Bologna third cycle degree are only included optionally in the EUROSTUDENT survey and therefore not discussed in this chapter, although this would certainly be insightful for the analyses of students' types and modes of study.

## Data and interpretation

The Bologna reforms and the introduction of the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) in 2010 have resulted in a substantial reorganisation of study programmes in the majority of its member states. This analysis takes a closer look at the distribution of students across the Bologna first and second cycle study programmes and their characteristics. The analysis also describes students enrolled in short-cycle higher education programmes. These programmes enjoy a special status in the Bologna reforms and are perceived as important in addressing the social dimension of higher education (Berlin Communiqué, 2003).

### Distribution of students across study programmes

*In just over half of the EUROSTUDENT countries, more than 90 % of students are enrolled in programmes corresponding to the Bologna two-cycle structure*


In just over half of the EUROSTUDENT countries, more than 90 % of students are enrolled in programmes corresponding to the Bologna two cycle structure (Figure 5.1). In the remaining countries, this share varies between 64 % and 87 %. On (unweighted) average across all EUROSTUDENT countries, around 70 % of students are enrolled in Bachelor programmes, another 20 % in Master programmes, whereas the remaining 10 % are distributed between short-cycle higher education programmes, long national programmes, and other national degrees/programmes.

- The share of students enrolled in Bachelor programmes varies between EUROSTUDENT countries. It fluctuates between more than 80 % in Russia, Georgia, Montenegro, Lithuania, Armenia, Ukraine, the Netherlands, Romania, Serbia, and Bosnia-Herzegovina to less than half in Malta, Sweden, and France.
- In all EUROSTUDENT countries apart from Russia, at least 10 % of students are enrolled in Master programmes. In around one quarter of the EUROSTUDENT countries, this share is more than 25 % (Switzerland, Slovakia, Czech Republic, Finland, Poland, Norway, and Malta).

Figure 5.1

## Enrolment in study programmes

Share of students (in %)



Data source: EUROSTUDENT V, C.1.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 1.1 Which study programme are you currently enrolled in?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions: DE, FI.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: DE, GE, IT.

## Distribution of students across study programmes by selected student characteristics

As discussed earlier, students' choice of study programme is related to their personal characteristics and backgrounds. To illustrate this, the following analyses take a closer look at the distribution of student groups across study programmes in the EUROSTUDENT countries. In doing so, the following groups of students are compared: high intensity and low intensity students and students with and without higher education background.

Students' participation in Bachelor and Master programmes varies with study intensity.


- In around three quarters of the EUROSTUDENT countries, the share of students enrolled in Bachelor programmes is higher among high intensity students than among low intensity students (Figure 5.2a). Especially in Romania, Latvia, and Norway, the share of high intensity students enrolled in Bachelor programmes is at least 30 percentage points higher than that of low intensity students.
- In one quarter of the EUROSTUDENT countries, the share of students enrolled in Bachelor programmes is higher among low intensity students compared to high intensity students (the Netherlands, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Hungary, Czech Republic, Italy, Croatia, and France). In Bosnia-Herzegovina, Italy, and France, this difference is at least 10 percentage points.
- The share of students enrolled in Master programmes is higher among low intensity students than among high intensity students in all of the EUROSTUDENT countries except the Netherlands, Czech Republic, Denmark, and Sweden (Figure 5.2b). In Georgia, Romania, Slovakia, and Latvia, the share of low intensity students enrolled in Master programmes is at least 20 percentage points higher than that of high

*In all EUROSTUDENT countries, the share of students in Master programmes is higher among low intensity students compared to high intensity students*

Figure 5.2

## Students' enrolment in Bachelor and Master study programmes by study intensity

Share of students (in %)



Data source: EUROSTUDENT V, C.1.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 1.1 Which study programme are you currently enrolled in?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions: FI.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: DE, GE, IT.

intensity students. Master students tend to be older (>Chapter 4) and spend a substantial portion of their time budget on paid employment (>Chapter 6). This rather explains the high share of Master students among low intensity students.

- Overall, low intensity students appear to find more favourable conditions in Master programmes in most EUROSTUDENT countries. It can be assumed that these study programmes offer more flexibility, allowing students to pursue their studies part-time while, for example, working.



Like the study intensity, the distribution of students in the Bachelor and Master programmes also differs based on their educational background (Figure 5.3).

- In three quarters of the EUROSTUDENT countries, the share of students enrolled in Bachelor programmes is higher among students without higher education background than among those with higher education background (Figure 5.3a). However, in eight countries, the share of students at the Bachelor level is higher among those with higher education background than among those without higher education background.
- At the Master level, in around two thirds of the EUROSTUDENT countries, the share of students is higher among students with higher education background than among their peers without higher education background (Figure 5.3b). However, in seven countries the share of students in Master programmes is greater among students without higher education background than among their peers with higher education background.<sup>2</sup>
- This suggests that students without higher education background tend to leave the higher education system after completing the first level of the Bologna two-cycle structure (>Chapter 3).

*In three quarters of the EUROSTUDENT countries, the share of students enrolled in Bachelor programmes is higher among students without higher education background than among those with higher education background*

There are further differences in the share of students in Bachelor and Master programmes according to sex, transition route, and finance-related characteristics of the students (Table A5.1). In the majority of EUROSTUDENT countries, the share of Bachelor students among males is higher than among female students. At the Master level, this is then reversed, with more Master students among females than among males (>Chapter 4). Also, the share of Bachelor students is higher among delayed transition students than among all students in the majority of countries. The share of Bachelor students is lower among students who are dependent on their own earnings than among those who are dependent on family/public support. Interestingly, at the Master level this is reversed with more Master students among students who are dependent on their own earnings than among those dependent on family/public support. It appears that the flexibility in the study structure at the Master level makes these programmes more appealing to certain student groups and especially students who are dependent on their own earnings. It can be assumed that the flexible structure at the Master level allows them to balance their employment and educational demands (>Chapter 6).

Continuing with the analysis of the distribution of students in various types of degree programmes, this section further describes the characteristics of students in short-cycle higher programmes and long national programmes (Figure 5.4). It must be noted that although data on these programmes are available only from a small number of countries (Short-cycle higher education programmes: 11 and long national programmes: 18), nonetheless their analysis provides interesting insights into the characteristics of students enrolled in these programmes.

- Apart from France, the share of students in short-cycle higher education programmes is higher among low intensity students than among high intensity students in all covered countries. In Norway this difference is more than 30 percentage points (Figure 5.4a).

*The share of students in short-cycle higher education programmes is higher among low intensity students, students without higher education background, and delayed transition students*


<sup>2</sup> This does not necessarily indicate less social selectivity as several of these countries offer long national degrees and typically students with HE background opt for these programmes.



Figure 5.3

## Students' enrolment in Bachelor and Master study programmes by educational background

Share of students (in %)



Data source: EUROSTUDENT V, C.1, C.2.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 1.1 Which study programme are you currently enrolled in?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions: FI.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: DE, GE, IT.

- In almost all of the covered countries, the share of students in short-cycle higher education programmes is greater among students without higher education background than among their peers with higher education background. This difference is especially large in Malta at 10 percentage points (Figure 5.4b).
- Further, the share of students in short-cycle higher education programmes is higher among delayed transition students than among all students in all covered countries apart from France (Figure 5.4c).
- In a vast majority of the countries, the share of students in short-cycle higher education programmes is also higher among older students and students dependent on their own earnings than among younger students and those who are dependent on family or public support (Table A5.2 and Table A5.3).

Figure 5.4

### Students' enrolment in short-cycle higher education programmes by study intensity, educational background, and transition route

Share of students (in %)



**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, C.1, C.2. **No data:** Delayed transition students: MT, NO. **Too few cases:** Delayed transition students: HR.

**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 1.1 Which study programme are you currently enrolled in?

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

- In the majority of countries for which data on long national programmes are available, the share of students in these programmes is higher among high intensity students than among low intensity students. However, in Austria, Armenia, and Switzerland, the share of students enrolled in long national programmes is higher among low intensity students than among high intensity students (Figure 5.5a).
- Again in the majority of countries, the share of students in long national programmes is higher among students with higher education background than among those without higher education background. In three countries (the Netherlands, Armenia, and Switzerland), there are no differences in the share of students between the two groups (Figure 5.5b).
- Like the educational background, the share of students in long national programmes is lower among delayed transition students than among all students in the majority of the countries. However in Serbia, the Netherlands, Armenia, Switzerland, and Montenegro this share is either equal to or higher than that among all students (Figure 5.5c).

Based on the above analyses, it is apparent that the short-cycle higher education programmes seem to be preferred by low intensity students, students without higher education background and delayed transition students, whereas long national programmes cater to high intensity students and those with higher education background in the majority of countries.

### Students' formal status of enrolment

*In more than  
half of the  
EUROSTUDENT  
countries at least  
80 % of students  
study with  
full-time status*

Flexible learning pathways and student-centred learning are considered necessary to enable diverse student groups attain higher education degrees at their own pace and in accordance with their needs, aspirations, and personal circumstances. One of the ways to create flexible learning pathways is through the provision of part-time courses. This section focuses on the distribution and characteristics of the students in part-time courses in all EUROSTUDENT countries.

- In more than half of the EUROSTUDENT countries, at least 80 % of students are enrolled as full-time students. In the EUROSTUDENT countries Austria, Georgia, and Finland part-time status does not exist (Table A5.4). In more than half of the EUROSTUDENT countries, at least 10 % of students have a part-time enrolment status. The distribution of students in part-time courses fluctuates between less than 5 % in Armenia, Germany, and Romania and more than 30 % in Poland (Table A5.4).

*Students with  
part-time status  
are often without  
higher education  
background, older,  
and dependent on  
their own income*


Further examination of the characteristics of students enrolled in part-time courses suggests differences in the enrolment patterns across student groups (Figure 5.6).

- In 70 % of the EUROSTUDENT countries for which data on part-time students are available, the share of students enrolled as part-time is higher among Master students than among Bachelor students. In Malta and Ireland, this difference is more than 40 percentage points (Figure 5.6a). In the countries Czech Republic, Lithuania, Slovenia, Switzerland, Russia, and Romania the share of students enrolled as part-time is higher among Bachelor students than among Master students.
- The share of students without higher education background enrolled as part-time is higher compared to those with higher education background in all of the countries (Figure 5.6b). In Poland, Czech Republic, Croatia, Sweden, and Hungary this difference is more than 10 percentage points.

Figure 5.5

## Students' enrolment in long national programmes by study intensity, educational background, and transition route

Share of students (in %)



Data source: EUROSTUDENT V, C.1, C.2. No data: Delayed transition students: MT, NO, PL.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 1.1 Which study programme are you currently enrolled in?


Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions: AT, FI.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: DE, GE, IT.

Figure 5.6

### Students' enrolment in part-time courses by type of study programme, educational background, and dependency on income source

Share of students (in %)



**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, C.7, C.8, C.9. **No data:** FR, ME, RS, UA; dependent on family support: AM, CZ, RO, RU; dependent on own earnings: AM, CZ, RO, RU; dependent on public support: AM, CZ, PL, RO, RU. **Too few cases:** Dependent on public support: BA, HR, MT, SK.

**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 1.2 What is your current formal status as a student?

**Notes:** In AT, FI, GE, part-time status does not exist. In DK, IT, LV, national samples comprise only full-time students.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** DK, FI, IT, LV.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

- The share of students enrolled as part-time is also higher among students who are dependent on their own earnings than among those who are dependent on family and public support in all of the countries (Figure 5.6c). Especially in Poland, Malta, Croatia, Sweden, Hungary, and Ireland the difference between the share of students dependent on their own earning with a part-time status and those dependent on family support with a part-time status is more than 40 percentage points.
- In all EUROSTUDENT countries, the share of students enrolled in part-time courses is also higher among older students compared to their younger peers (Table A5.5). Older students spend a considerable amount of their time on paid jobs (>Chapter 6). These students therefore seem to be opting for part-time study courses and flexible study structures as a way to balance their work and educational demands. Further, Master students, students without higher education background and those dependent on their own income also tend to be older than their respective counterparts (>Chapter 4). Age rather explains the high share of part-time students among these student groups.


Further, students' formal status is compared with their time spent on study-related activities. The data are based on student entries on how they divide their time between taught courses, personal study time, and paid jobs (Table A5.6). On (unweighted) average across EUROSTUDENT countries, around 20 % of the students studying with full-time status spend less than 20 hours per week on study-related activities. This suggests that these students are studying as de-facto part-time students irrespective of their formal enrolment status.

*Students' study intensity does not always reflect their formal enrolment status*

**Figure 5.7**

**Students' study intensity by formal status of enrolment in a typical study week**

Share of students (in %)



**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, C.11. **No data:** FR, ME, RO, RS, UA. **Too few cases:** Students with part-time status and study-related activities of 21 hours or more per week: AM.

**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 1.2 What is your current formal status as a student?, 3.14 How many hours do you spend in a typical week in taught courses and on personal study time?

**Notes:** In AT, FI, GE, part-time status does not exist. In DK, IT, LV, national samples comprise only full-time students.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** DK, FI, IT, LV.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

- In around 80 % of the EUROSTUDENT countries, at least half of the full-time students spend more than 30 hours per week on study-related activities (Table A5.6).
- On the other hand in Russia, Austria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Poland, Latvia, and the Netherlands more than one in five full-time students spend no more than 20 hours per week on study-related activities, and are thus studying as de-facto part-time students (Figure 5.7).
- In more than half of the countries for which data are available on part-time students, at least 50 % of part-time students do not spend more than 20 hours per week on study-related activities (Table A5.6). This suggests a consistency between their part-time status and the time spent on study-related activities.
- However, in Russia, Poland, Lithuania, Slovenia, Croatia, and Germany more than 60 % of students with a part-time status spend more than 20 hours per week on study-related activities. In these countries the amount of time spent on study-related activities does not reflect their part-time status (Figure 5.7).
- It appears that students' formal status of enrolment may not always reflect their study intensity. In many countries, students are able to adjust the amount of time spent on study-related activities. Students may do so for a variety of reasons, especially, to balance their work and study requirements.

## Discussion and policy considerations

This chapter follows the analysis of the transition routes to higher education (>[Chapter 2](#)) and examines the issue of higher education access in relation to students' enrolment in study programmes and their formal enrolment status. A critical question after the introduction of the Bologna reforms that still remains is whether the newly redesigned study programmes attract student groups differently. Unfortunately, this question cannot be addressed completely by using only EUROSTUDENT data. However, an examination of students' enrolment in study programmes in the EUROSTUDENT countries definitely offers interesting insights.

Firstly, different students tend to enrol in different types of study programmes. Bachelor programmes appear to attract high intensity students and students without higher education background. On the other hand, Master programmes are especially attractive to low intensity students, students without higher education background, and those dependent on their own earnings. Especially short-cycle higher education programmes and long national programmes appear to appeal to particular student groups. Short-cycle higher education programmes have a higher share of low intensity students, students without higher education background, delayed transition students, older students, and students dependent on their own earnings. Apparently, they do serve the special purpose that they were designated to fulfil during the Berlin Summit, i.e. to provide skills for employment as well as to prepare students for further higher education studies. Based on the results from this chapter as well as other studies on short-cycle programmes, it can be concluded that these are important instruments for widening access to higher education for previously underrepresented student groups and in facilitating lifelong learning (Kirsch, Beernaert, & Nørgaard, 2003; Slantcheva-Durst, 2010). While it is evident that a higher share of students without higher education background, older students, or those who enter higher education with a delay are

making use of these programmes, at the same time it is also important to monitor these programmes closely with regard to their role in increasing social mobility, i.e. whether students who graduate from these programme engage in further education. While short-cycle higher education programmes offer the possibility of achieving higher education, at the same time they might increase (horizontal) inequality in access to higher education if only certain types of students use them and/or if the graduates from these programmes do not continue with further education afterwards.

Another important aspect covered in this chapter is the issue of flexible study structure and part-time courses. A large number of countries offer part-time courses to their students and many students are taking advantage of this opportunity. The students enrolled in part-time courses share some common characteristics across all countries. These students tend to be without higher education background, older, and dependent on their own income. The analysis of students' employment rate also shows that a higher share of students from these groups engage in employment alongside studies and dedicate a substantial share of their time budget towards paid jobs (> [Chapter 6](#)). This shows that students in these groups are apparently deliberately opting for part-time courses to meet their professional and educational demands.

In summary, recent developments in higher education in Europe have resulted in a substantial reorganisation of study programmes. Differences continue to exist by student groups in the study programmes and their mode of delivery.



# Tables

Table A5.1

## Students' enrolment in Bachelor and Master study programmes by sex, transition route, and dependency on income source

Share of students (in %)

Country	Male		Female		Delayed		Dependent on family support		Dependent on own earnings		Dependent on public support	
	Bachelor [ISCED 6]	Master [ISCED 7]	Bachelor [ISCED 6]	Master [ISCED 7]	Bachelor [ISCED 6]	Master [ISCED 7]	Bachelor [ISCED 6]	Master [ISCED 7]	Bachelor [ISCED 6]	Master [ISCED 7]	Bachelor [ISCED 6]	Master [ISCED 7]
AM	86	7	80	15	87	4	–	–	–	–	–	–
AT	51	16	49	12	55	14	52	11	42	18	56	15
BA	80	13	80	11	78	19	79	11	85	12	82	7
CH	71	25	72	25	74	18	77	21	64	30	70	26
CZ	70	30	67	33	80	20	–	–	–	–	–	–
DE	65	14	58	13	71	10	60	12	60	16	68	12
DK	60	17	63	19	63	16	72	16	59	18	67	17
EE	75	17	69	24	82	16	77	13	63	30	78	15
FI	63	37	63	37	67	33	68	32	54	46	75	25
FR	39	20	45	24	47	39	42	16	42	37	49	17
GE	86	14	85	15	89	11	89	11	58	42	•	•
HR	65	20	63	21	79	19	65	17	61	31	59	29
HU	76	14	70	15	80	12	72	11	68	24	76	12
IE	77	15	80	14	71	12	87	9	61	29	91	2
IT	68	17	64	16	81	13	59	19	68	21	56	21
LT	87	13	84	15	88	12	89	10	76	23	85	11
LV	66	21	61	24	39	23	73	14	42	41	75	15
ME	86	13	84	16	89	10	90	10	77	23	88	13
MT	46	26	49	25	–	–	52	16	34	40	79	9
NL	83	14	81	15	84	8	78	18	77	17	89	9
NO	49	28	52	23	40	31	45	32	33	27	62	23
PL	66	23	58	28	–	–	67	19	56	29	–	–
RO	82	17	80	19	80	18	–	–	–	–	–	–
RS	82	15	79	17	86	7	80	16	84	14	81	14
RU	91	9	94	6	79	21	–	–	–	–	–	–
SE	40	50	48	42	49	36	40	52	38	47	49	43
SI	68	10	72	13	51	27	71	9	66	17	72	10
SK	69	25	68	27	65	33	70	24	65	34	73	23
UA	83	17	82	18	77	23	81	19	84	17	88	12

– no data • too few cases

Data source: EUROSTUDENT V, C.2, C.3.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 1.1 Which study programme are you currently enrolled in?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions: FI.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: DE, GE, IT.

Table A5.2

**Students' enrolment in short-cycle higher education programmes and long national programmes by age groups**

Share of students (in %)

Country	Younger than 22 years		At least 22 but younger than 25 years		At least 25 but younger than 30 years		At least 30 years	
	Short Cycle [ISCED 5]	Long national degree [ISCED 7]	Short Cycle [ISCED 5]	Long national degree [ISCED 7]	Short Cycle [ISCED 5]	Long national degree [ISCED 7]	Short Cycle [ISCED 5]	Long national degree [ISCED 7]
AM	3	1	2	1	7	2	6	1
AT	0	26	0	32	0	44	0	44
BA	0	5	0	8	0	18	0	6
CH	0	0	0	0.1	0	1	0	4
CZ	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DE	0	19	0	22	0	33	0	35
DK	36	0	20	0	15	0	21	0
EE	0	8	0	9	0	8	0	3
FI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FR	36	8	4	20	2	11	2	3
GE	0	0	0	0	0	0	•	•
HR	1	15	0	18	0	18	0	2
HU	0	12	0	12	0	20	0	11
IE	4	0	4	0	10	0	14	0
IT	0	18	0	20	0	17	0	6
LT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
LV	15	0	8	0	12	0	37	0
ME	0	0.4	0	0.3	0	0	0	1
MT	31	1	27	2	11	0	23	0
NL	0.4	1	1	1	2	2	5	1
NO	14	6	7	8	13	9	39	2
PL	0	8	0	7	0	11	0	11
RO	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RS	0	4	0	4	0	4	0	8
RU	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SE	9	0	5	0	7	0	19	0
SI	7	14	4	13	6	8	8	9
SK	0	6	0	6	0	2	0	4
UA	0	0	0	0	–	–	–	–

– no data • too few cases

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, C.2.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 1.1 Which study programme are you currently enrolled in?**Notes:** Students enrolled in programmes at ISCED 2011 level 5 (Short-cycle tertiary education) are not included in the German sample as these programmes are typically not considered to be higher education in Germany.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** AT, FI.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

Table A5.3

**Students' enrolment in short-cycle higher education programmes and long national programmes by dependency on income source**

Share of students (in %)

Country	Dependent on family support		Dependent on own earnings		Dependent on public support	
	Short Cycle [ISCED 5]	Long national degree [ISCED 7]	Short Cycle [ISCED 5]	Long national degree [ISCED 7]	Short Cycle [ISCED 5]	Long national degree [ISCED 7]
AM	–	–	–	–	–	–
AT	0	37	0	40	0	28
BA	0	10	0	2	0	11
CH	0	0.4	0	2	0	0
CZ	–	–	–	–	–	–
DE	0	28	0	23	0	19
DK	12	0	23	0	16	0
EE	0	10	0	6	0	7
FI	0	0	0	0	0	0
FR	30	11	9	11	27	5
GE	0	0	0	0	•	•
HR	0	18	0	8	0	12
HU	0	17	0	8	0	13
IE	4	0	10	0	6	0
IT	0	22	0	12	0	23
LT	0	0	0	0	0	0
LV	13	0	17	0	10	0
ME	0	0	0	0	0	0
MT	29	1	23	0.4	11	1
NL	0.4	2	3	1	1	1
NO	20	3	38	3	8	8
PL	0	9	0	6	–	–
RO	–	–	–	–	–	–
RS	0	4	0	3	0	5
RU	–	–	–	–	–	–
SE	9	0	15	0	8	0
SI	4	16	9	8	2	16
SK	0	6	0	1	0	4
UA	0	0	0	0	0	0

– no data • too few cases

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, C.3.

**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 1.1 Which study programme are you currently enrolled in?

**Notes:** Students enrolled in programmes at ISCED 2011 level 5 (Short-cycle tertiary education) are also not included in the German sample as these programmes are typically not considered to be higher education in Germany.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** AT, FI.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

Table A5.4

**Students' formal status of enrolment by sex**

Share of students (in %)

Country	All students			Male			Female		
	Full-time	Part-time	Other	Full-time	Part-time	Other	Full-time	Part-time	Other
AM	98	1	1	98	1	1	98	1	1
AT	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0
BA	87	13	0	86	14	0	88	12	0
CH	90	11	0	88	12	0	91	9	0
CZ	66	29	6	68	29	3	64	28	7
DE	94	1	5	93	1	6	95	1	4
DK	100	–	–	100	–	–	100	–	–
EE	91	9	0	90	10	0	92	9	0
FI	83	17	0	83	17	0	83	17	0
FR	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
GE	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0
HR	74	25	0.3	72	28	0	76	23	0.4
HU	77	23	0	80	20	0	75	25	0
IE	80	20	0	77	23	0	83	17	0
IT	100	–	–	100	–	–	100	–	–
LT	74	26	0	73	27	0	75	26	0
LV	100	–	–	100	–	–	100	–	–
ME	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
MT	75	26	0	76	24	0	73	27	0
NL	87	11	2	87	11	2	88	10	2
NO	84	15	1	78	21	1	74	25	1
PL	65	36	0	65	35	0	64	36	0
RO	97	1	2	97	1	2	98	1	2
RS	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
RU	95	6	0	98	2	0	93	7	0
SE	77	23	0	81	19	0	74	26	0
SI	89	11	0	90	10	0	89	11	0
SK	82	18	0	85	15	0	80	21	0
UA	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

– no data

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, C.7, C.8.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 1.2 What is your current formal status as a student?**Notes:** In AT, FI, GE part-time status does not exist. In DK, IT, LV national samples comprise only full-time students.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** DK, FI, IT, LV.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

Table A5.5

**Students' formal status of enrolment by transition route and selected age groups**

Share of students (in %)

Country	Delayed			Younger than 22 years			At least 30 years		
	Full-time	Part-time	Other	Full-time	Part-time	Other	Full-time	Part-time	Other
AM	97	0.4	2	98	0.4	1	90	8	3
AT	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0
BA	55	45	0	91	9	0	42	59	0
CH	61	39	0	98	2	0	73	27	0
CZ	15	75	11	91	7	2	7	78	15
DE	91	1	8	93	0.4	7	84	3	13
DK	100	–	–	100	–	–	100	–	–
EE	89	12	0	98	2	0	82	18	0
FI	73	27	0	99	1	0	62	38	0
FR	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
GE	100	0	0	100	0	0	•	•	•
HR	27	73	0	90	10	0.1	12	88	0
HU	37	63	0	97	3	0	13	88	0
IE	67	33	0	98	2	0	47	53	0
IT	100	–	–	100	–	–	100	–	–
LT	28	72	0	90	10	0	29	72	0
LV	100	–	–	100	–	–	100	–	–
ME	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
MT	–	–	–	100	0.4	0	30	70	0
NL	39	57	4	99	0.4	1	21	74	5
NO	63	36	1	95	3	1	36	62	2
PL	–	–	–	79	21	0	20	80	0
RO	94	3	4	97	1	2	89	2	9
RS	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
RU	50	50	0	99	1	0	55	46	0
SE	72	29	0	94	6	0	37	63	0
SI	59	41	0	98	2	0	48	52	0
SK	29	71	0	97	3	0	18	82	0
UA	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

– no data • too few cases

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, C.8.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 1.2 What is your current formal status as a student?**Notes:** In AT, FI, GE part-time status does not exist. In DK, IT, LV national samples comprise only full-time students.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** DK, FI, IT, LV.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

Table A5.6

## Students' study intensity by formal status of enrolment in a typical study week

Share of students (in %)

	Up to 10 h/w			11–20 H/w			21–30 H/w			> 30 H/w		
	Full-time	Part-time	Other	Full-time	Part-time	Other	Full-time	Part-time	Other	Full-time	Part-time	Other
AM	0	•	•	3	•	•	8	•	•	90	•	•
AT	13	–	–	16	–	–	24	–	–	47	–	–
BA	4	18	–	15	37	–	25	21	–	56	24	–
CH	5	9	–	12	36	–	22	37	–	62	19	–
CZ	5	42	31	24	38	35	36	14	20	35	6	15
DE	3	17	8	11	22	17	24	26	17	62	35	58
DK	12	–	–	16	–	–	20	–	–	53	–	–
EE	7	24	–	17	32	–	25	20	–	50	24	–
FI	3	27	–	12	36	–	22	22	–	64	16	–
FR	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
GE	4	–	–	15	–	–	31	–	–	50	–	–
HR	3	6	•	11	22	•	21	28	•	66	43	•
HU	5	14	–	12	30	–	21	27	–	63	30	–
IE	1	13	–	8	41	–	24	27	–	67	20	–
IT	7	–	–	11	–	–	17	–	–	64	–	–
LT	4	12	–	13	27	–	27	19	–	56	42	–
LV	2	–	–	19	–	–	29	–	–	51	–	–
ME	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
MT	0.2	16	–	5	42	–	17	37	–	79	6	–
NL	7	13	12	14	38	34	24	31	26	55	19	28
NO	3	41	23	13	34	27	26	16	13	59	10	37
PL	5	5	–	19	27	–	25	44	–	51	24	–
RO	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
RS	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
RU	28	9	–	6	4	–	16	21	–	50	67	–
SE	2	26	–	8	43	–	16	20	–	74	11	–
SI	6	6	–	9	24	–	22	25	–	63	46	–
SK	2	12	–	13	42	–	33	32	–	52	15	–
UA	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

– no data • too few cases

Data source: EUROSTUDENT V, C.11.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 1.2 What is your current formal status as a student?, 3.14. How many hours do you spend in a typical week in taught courses and on personal study time?

Notes: In AT, FI, GE part-time status does not exist. In DK, IT, LV national samples comprise only full-time students.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions: DK, IT, LV, FI.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: DE, GE, IT.



## Chapter 6

# Employment and time budget

### Key findings

- **Students' employment rate:** In more than half of the EUROSTUDENT countries, at least 40 % of students not living with parents engage in paid employment alongside their studies. The employment rate varies especially with students' educational background and age. Employment during term-time is more common among students without higher education background. Older students also engage in paid jobs more frequently than their younger peers.
- **Students' motivation to work:** Students mainly work alongside their studies to finance their living, improve their living standard, and to gain work experience. In almost two thirds of the EUROSTUDENT countries, 'improving living standard' is the most common reason why students take up paid jobs. In about one third of the EUROSTUDENT countries, the majority of students work during term-time to finance their living. Students' motivation to work is dependent on their educational background and age. In all EUROSTUDENT countries, students without higher education background take up paid jobs mainly to finance their living, whereas in the majority of countries students with higher education background work more often to gain experience. Likewise, in all of the countries, older students (at least 30 years old) engage in paid employment more often to finance their living.
- **Students' overall time budget:** The weekly time budget of students not living with parents is relatively higher than that of their peers living at home. In most of the countries, students have a weekly time budget of more than 40 hours which includes time spent on taught studies, personal study time, and paid jobs. Age is strongly related to students' overall time budget as well as its composition. Older students have a higher overall time budget and they tend to spend considerably more time on paid jobs compared to those who are younger than 22 years in all EUROSTUDENT countries.
- **Time spent on study-related activities by extent of paid employment:** Students with no paid employment during term-time, on average across all EUROSTUDENT countries, spend 38 hours per week on study-related activities (taught studies and personal study time). Increasing time spent on gainful employment is associated with a reduction in time for study-related activities as well as an overall increase in students' time budget. This implies that additional time spent on paid jobs is balanced by cutting down on study-related activities, but also at the expense of students' leisure time.



## Main issues

As more and more higher education students engage in employment alongside their studies, questions concerning whether or not paid employment affects academic performance have been raised. Interest in this area is growing, especially after the introduction of the Bologna reforms and the subsequent changes in the composition and characteristics of the student body entering and participating in higher education. In this context, this chapter explores the patterns of students' employment, their motives for working, and their time budget in a typical study week during term-time.

### Employment alongside studies

Student employment is becoming a common feature of higher education in many countries (Curtis & Williams, 2002; Metcalf, 2003; Auers, Rostoks, & Smith, 2007; Beerkens, Mägi, & Lill, 2010; Orr, Gwosć, & Netz, 2011). Extensive research evidence on students' employment is available from the United States and United Kingdom. These studies suggest that an increasing number of higher education students are working during term-time (Curtis, 2007; Callender, 2008; Tessema, Ready, & Astani, 2014). The evidence on European students' employment patterns also suggests that the phenomenon of student employment alongside studies is widespread in many countries across Europe (Auers et al., 2007; Beerkens, Mägi, & Lill, 2010; Orr, Gwosć, & Netz, 2011).

While employment during term-time is a reality in many countries, some student groups engage in paid employment more often than others. Studies have shown that students from disadvantaged backgrounds (Callender, 2008), older students, and students with no financial aid to support their education (Auers, Rostoks, & Smith, 2007; Beerkens, Mägi, & Lill, 2010) are more likely to engage in paid employment. Likewise, the motives for engaging in paid employment have also been found to vary across student groups. Financial reasons have been found to be the motive behind a significant majority of students taking up paid employment, with students working mainly to support their living and to fund their education (Callender, 2008). This was found to be especially true for students from low income groups (Callender, 2008; Beerkens, Mägi, & Lill, 2010). Further possible reasons for engaging in employment are maintaining or improving the standard of living, gaining work experience or practical skills, networking with managers and future employers, and socialising and meeting new people (Curtis, 2007; Callender, 2008; Tessema, Ready, & Astani, 2014).

In this context, this chapter examines the pattern of students' employment across EUROSTUDENT countries and across student groups and describes students' motives for engaging in paid employment alongside studies.

### Implications of paid employment

Existing findings on the relationship between paid employment and academic achievement are somewhat inconclusive. While some studies suggest that paid employment can adversely affect academic performance, having detrimental effects ranging from lower grades, missed lectures, to reduced time available for study-related activities (Curtis & Williams, 2002; Metcalf, 2003; Auers, Rostoks, & Smith, 2007), others have documented various benefits. Employment alongside studies does not necessarily have negative consequences and can benefit students both personally and academically. This

is especially true when the jobs are related to students' fields of study. Students employed in paid jobs related to their subject areas, may be able to transfer theoretical knowledge acquired during lectures into their workplace practice (Watts & Pickering, 2000). The positive effects can also include enhanced employability, increased confidence, and better organisational and time management skills (Curtis & William, 2002).

The evidence on the relationship between hours devoted towards paid employment and academic achievement is also mixed and contradicting. A study conducted by Hammond (2006) in the United States, shows that working between one to 15 hours per week may have a positive effect on academic performance. According to another study, employment has a positive effect on academic performance and students' satisfaction when students work for fewer than 10 hours (Tessema, Ready, & Astani, 2014). In the European context, students in paid jobs of 15 hours or more per week have been found to spend the least time on study-related activities when compared to students who do not work and students who engage in six to 10 hours of paid employment per week (Orr, Schnitzer, & Frackmann, 2008; Orr, Gwosć, & Netz, 2011).

In order to understand students' weekly routine and time distribution between study-related activities and paid jobs, this chapter will examine students' time budget.

## Methodological and conceptual notes

In understanding the patterns of students' employment, two aspects are considered in this chapter: the employment rate of students in EUROSTUDENT countries and their overall weekly time budget. The employment rate describes the extent of paid employment during term-time. In calculating the employment rate, both jobs performed from time to time during the semester and jobs held during the whole semester are considered. In this, close attention is also paid to describing students' personal characteristics, their motivation for engaging in paid employment, and the relationship between their employment activity and fields of study.

The analysis of students' weekly time budget shows the distribution of time between working and studying in a typical week. In the examination of students' weekly time budget, a differentiation is made between three basic components: taught studies, personal study time, and paid jobs. Taught studies refer to the hours that students spend on study units organised by their higher education institution and mainly include activities such as lectures, seminars, tests, or unpaid jobs in laboratories. Students' personal study time comprises activities such as reading, revising, practicing, preparing for lectures and tests as well as writing assignments. Taught studies and personal study time are collectively referred to as study-related activities. The category paid jobs includes regular and gainful employment activities during the term-time. Jobs performed only during semester breaks are excluded. It must be noted that the data on students' time budget are based on students' overall assessment of their time budget and not, for instance based on a daily diary (as e.g. used to assess German students' time budget by Metzger & Schulmeister, 2011). Systematic differences between student groups are investigated for all aspects of students' employment and their time budget.

## Notes on national surveys

Some countries deviated slightly from the EUROSTUDENT survey conventions, which limits the international comparability of their data on a small number of indicators concerning students' employment rate and time budget.

- In some countries (Germany and Austria) the response options for certain questions were slightly different from those in the EUROSTUDENT core questionnaire. With regard to the indicator on employment rate during term-time, in Germany, the students were asked if they work sometimes, most of the time, or all the time, instead of whether they work time to time, less than five hours per week or more than five hours per week. The Austrian survey included slightly different response options for the question on students' motivation to work (I work for 'fun and interest' instead of I work 'because I have free time').
- In France, data on employment rate during term-time are based on students' employment for the full academic year instead of the current semester, thereby including paid work outside of term-time.
- The data on Lithuanian students' employment rate are of limited international comparability because of large number of missing values in the employment data.

## Strengths and shortcomings of EUROSTUDENT data

EUROSTUDENT data on employment and time budget capture how students' employment rate and their weekly time budget for study-related activities (taught studies and personal study time) and paid jobs vary across countries and student groups. EUROSTUDENT data also show how students' motives for engaging in paid jobs vary across student groups. Data allowing such detailed analyses of students' employment forms and time budget are rarely available from other sources.

Although this would certainly be insightful for the analysis of students' time budget, time dedicated to social engagement, household and caring duties, leisure activities or sleeping is not captured. Furthermore, while EUROSTUDENT data collects information on the distribution of time between study-related activities and paid jobs however, it does not include information on students' grades and graduation rates. Therefore, the effect of paid employment on students' academic performance cannot be captured completely by the EUROSTUDENT data.

## Data and interpretation

### Students' employment rate

*In more than half of the EUROSTUDENT countries, at least 40% of students engage in paid employment alongside their studies*

This analysis takes a closer look at the employment rate of higher education students to understand how widespread the phenomenon of paid employment is across EUROSTUDENT countries and across student groups. The focus is on students not living with their parents because, in most of the EUROSTUDENT countries, the majority of the students are not living with their parents (>Chapter 9).


Employment alongside studies is a common feature of higher education in all EUROSTUDENT countries (Figure 6.1).

- In more than half of the EUROSTUDENT countries, at least 40% of students not living with parents engage in paid employment alongside their studies (Figure 6.1).

Figure 6.1

**Employment rate during term-time of students not living with parents by age groups**

Students' employment rate (in %)



**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, H.1, H.2. **No data:** SL, SK; at least 22 but younger than 25 years: MT; at least 25 but younger than 30 years: UA; at least 30 years: UA. **Too few cases:** At least 25 but younger than 30 years: AM, GE; at least 30 years: GE, RU.

**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 3.9 Do you have a paid job during the current semester?

**Notes:** The categories 'working from time to time during the semester', 'working during the whole semester, less than five hours per week' and 'working during the whole semester, five hours or more per week' were aggregated to calculate the employment rate.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** DE, FR, LT.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

The employment rate is at least 60 % or higher in over one quarter of the EUROSTUDENT countries (Ireland, the Netherlands, Czech Republic, Estonia, Switzerland, Malta, Poland, and Austria).

- While working alongside studies is a reality in all EUROSTUDENT countries, the employment rate of students varies considerably between countries (Figure 6.1). In Ireland and the Netherlands, at least three quarters of students are employed, while in Serbia, Lithuania, Bosnia-Herzegovina, and Armenia, less than one quarter of students work.

In the majority of EUROSTUDENT countries, the employment rate of students without higher education background is greater than that of students with higher education background (Table A6.2).

- The difference in the employment rate between students without higher education background and those with higher education backgrounds is at least five percentage points in three quarters of these countries. In Italy, the employment rate is almost two times higher for students without higher education background (Table A6.2).
- However, there are also countries (Bosnia-Herzegovina, Denmark, Georgia, Montenegro, Serbia, and Ukraine) where the share of students without higher education background with paid jobs is relatively lower than their peers with higher education backgrounds (Table A6.2). Of these countries, Georgia, Ukraine, Serbia, and Bosnia-Herzegovina also report some of the lowest employment rates, overall (Figure 6.1).

In addition to students' educational background, the employment rate also differs by students' type of study programme, study intensity, and transition route (Table A6.2).

The share of Master students with paid jobs is higher compared to Bachelor students in all EUROSTUDENT countries. Likewise, in all of the countries, low intensity and delayed transitions students engage in employment more often than high intensity and all students, respectively. Differences in the employment rate are also apparent by students' field of study. In the majority of countries, students of humanities and arts engage in paid jobs more often than their peers studying engineering, manufacturing, and construction (> [DRM](#)).

**Age plays a crucial role in students' employment. Older students tend to be employed more frequently than their younger counterparts**

Age also plays a crucial role in employment rate (Figure 6.1). Older students tend to be employed more frequently than their younger counterparts. In 17 EUROSTUDENT countries, at least three quarters of the students who are 30 years or older have a paid job. It is noteworthy that countries with some of the lowest employment rates (Georgia, Ukraine, Armenia) also report lowest mean ages for their students (> [Chapter 4](#)). Students without higher education background, Master students, low intensity, and delayed transition students also tend to be older (> [Chapter 4](#)). This to a certain extent explains higher employment rates among these groups.

### Students' motivation to work

**In almost two thirds of the EUROSTUDENT countries, 'improving living standard' is the most common reason why students take up paid jobs**

As described earlier, students may engage in paid employment alongside their studies for a number of reasons which may vary by students' personal and social characteristics. In the EUROSTUDENT survey, the reasons for students' employment were grouped into four categories: 'to finance their living', 'to improve their living standard', 'to gain experience on the labour market', and because students 'have free time'.

Students appear to work alongside their studies mainly to improve their living standard or to finance their living (Table A6.3). In almost two thirds of the EUROSTUDENT countries, 'improving living standard' is the most common reason why students take up paid jobs. In almost all EUROSTUDENT countries (exceptions are Austria and Ukraine), at least 60 % of students who work do so to improve their living standard. In about one third of the EUROSTUDENT countries, the majority of employed students work during term-time to finance their living. In Denmark, Finland, Ireland, and Norway this share is higher than 80 %. Much less students engage in employment because they have spare time. In Austria, this group includes 43 % of employed students, followed by Russia (39 %), Poland (37 %), Bosnia-Herzegovina (32 %), and Armenia (31 %). In the other countries, the share of students indicating that this was an important reason for working does not exceed 29 %.

**Students with higher education background and older students work more often to finance their living**


Compared with students with higher education background, students without higher education background take up employment to finance their living more frequently, whereas students with higher education background work more often to gain experience on the labour market (Figure 6.2).

■ In all EUROSTUDENT countries, the share of students who work to finance their living is greater among students without higher education background when compared to their peers with higher education background (Figure 6.2a). Especially in Croatia, Italy, Germany, Switzerland, Slovenia, Hungary, France, Montenegro, and Bosnia-Herzegovina, the share of students who work to finance their living is at least 1.3 times higher for students without higher education background.

Figure 6.2

## Students' motivation to work by educational background

Share of all working students for whom the statement applies totally and mainly (in %)



**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, H.8, H.9. **No data:** SK; to gain experience on the labour market, educational background: UA. **Too few cases:** Students without HE background: AM

**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 3.9 Do you have a paid job during the current semester?, 3.10 To what extent do the following statements apply to your situation?

**Notes:** Values shown are aggregated shares of the categories 'applies totally' and 'applies mainly'.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

■ Apart from Malta, Italy, Slovenia, France, and Serbia, the share of students with higher education background who work to gain experience on the labour market is greater than that of their peers without higher education backgrounds in all EUROSTUDENT countries (Figure 6.2b).

In all EUROSTUDENT countries (except Poland and Serbia), older students (at least 30 years) engage in paid employment more often to finance their living compared to their younger (younger than 22 years) counterparts (Table A6.3).

■ This difference is particularly evident in the cases of Bosnia-Herzegovina, Switzerland, Czech Republic, Germany, France, Hungary, Sweden, and Slovenia, where the

*In the majority of countries, at least two in five employed students engage in employment activities*



share of older students who work to finance their living is at least two times higher than that of younger students (Table A6.3).

### Relationship between students' field of study and their employment

*which are closely  
related to their  
field of study*

As discussed above, paid employment alongside studies need not necessarily impact students' study progress and success negatively, especially when the employment activity is related to student's field of study.

In the majority of EUROSTUDENT countries, at least two in five employed students engage in employment activities which are closely related to their field of study (Table A6.4).

■ In Estonia, Finland, Latvia, Norway, Romania, and Sweden this share is at least 50 %. However, more than 50 % of students in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, Ireland, the Netherlands, Poland, Serbia, and Slovakia have paid jobs that are unrelated to their field of study (> DRM).

*Master students,  
low intensity  
students, delayed  
transition stu-  
dents, and those  
dependent on  
their own income  
are more often  
employed in jobs  
which are closely  
related to their  
field of study*

In the majority of countries, the share of students in paid jobs closely related to their field of study is greater among students with higher education background than among their peers without higher education background (Figure 6.3a). However, in two fifths of the EUROSTUDENT countries, the share of students in paid jobs closely related to their fields of study is greater among students without higher education background than among those with higher education background. In Norway, Malta, and Russia this difference is at least 10 percentage points.

In addition to educational background, the relationship between employment activity and students' field of study also differs based on students' type of study programme, study intensity, transition route, and dependency on income source (Table A6.4). In all EUROSTUDENT countries the share of Master students in paid jobs closely related to their field of study is higher compared to Bachelor students. Further, the share of students employed in jobs which are closely related to their field of study is higher among low intensity, delayed transition, and students who are dependent on their own income.

Furthermore, the relationship between employment activity and field of study varies with students' age (Figure 6.3b). In all countries, students who are at least 30 years old engage more often in jobs that are closely related to their field of study as compared to their younger counterparts. This may be an indication that these are older students who return to study in a field related to their occupation.

### Time budget of students by housing situation


*Students in most  
countries have a  
time budget of  
more than 40  
hours in a typical  
study week*

The time budget of students living with parents varies from less than 40 hours per week in Finland, Sweden, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Lithuania, Georgia, France, Denmark, and Czech Republic to more than 60 hours per week in Armenia and Poland (Figure 6.4a). For students living with parents, taught studies make up the single largest component of their time budget in almost 70% of the EUROSTUDENT countries. In another six countries (Malta, Italy, Norway, Austria, the Netherlands, and Sweden), time spent on personal studies form the largest share of students' time budget. In two countries (Poland and Estonia), paid jobs constitute the largest share of students' time budget (Figure 6.4a).

Figure 6.3

### Students' assessment of extent of relationship between their field of study and employment activity by educational background and age groups

Share of all working students with jobs (very) closely related to their field of study (in %)



**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, H.11, H.12. **No data:** DE, IT; at least 25 but younger than 30 years: UA; at least 30 years: UA **Too few cases:** At least 30 years: AM, GE, RU

**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 3.9 Do you have a paid job during the current semester?, 3.11 How closely related is your job to the content of your study programme?

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.


In almost all EUROSUTUDENT countries (exceptions are Estonia and Bosnia-Herzegovina), the weekly time budget of students not living with their parents is higher compared to their peers living with parents (Figure 6.4b). For students not living with parents, taught studies make up the single largest component of students' time budget in two thirds of the EUROSUTUDENT countries. In another three countries (Poland, Malta, and Czech Republic), paid jobs make up the single largest share of students' time budget and in the remaining six countries (Italy, Norway, Austria, the Netherlands, Sweden, and Denmark) personal studies are the single largest component (Figure 6.4b).



Figure 6.4

**Time budget of students by housing situation**

Students' time budget by type of activity (in hours/week)

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, I.1. **No data:** UA.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 3.13 How many hours do you spend on paid jobs in a typical week during this semester?, 3.14 How many hours do you spend in a typical week in taught courses and on personal study time?**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

In half of the EUROSTUDENT countries, students living at home spend a marginally higher time on taught studies compared to students not living at home (Figure 6.4).

- This difference is highest in Malta at seven hours per week, and ranges between one hour per week and three hours per week in the remaining countries.
- In 10 countries (Poland, Estonia, Slovenia, Montenegro, Serbia, Slovakia, Romania, Georgia, Lithuania, and Denmark), there are no differences in the time spent on taught studies by students' housing situation (Figure 6.4).
- In Armenia, Italy, and Croatia students not living at home spend one hour per week more on taught studies compared to students living at home.

In the majority of EUROSTUDENT countries, students not living with their parents spend more time on personal studies than students living with their parents. This difference is however marginal and fluctuates between one hour per week and four hours per week (Figure 6.4).

- However, in Malta, Latvia, Austria, Bosnia-Herzegovina, and Georgia students living with parents spend marginally more time on personal studies than their counterparts who are living with parents.

In all countries except Armenia, Estonia, and Lithuania, students not living with parents spend more time on paid jobs than those living at home (Figure 6.4). This difference is highest in Malta at 12 hours per week. For students who are not living at home, the employment rate and weekly time budget for a regular paid job are related in some countries.

- The employment rate and the average time spent on paid job is high in Poland, Malta, and Czech Republic.
- In Armenia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, and Lithuania employment rate and weekly time budget for a paid job are low.
- On the other hand, Germany and Denmark have high employment rate (more than 50 %) however, students on an average spend less than 10 hours per week on paid jobs.

A detailed examination of the time budget of different student groups reveals differences related to their overall time budget as well as its composition.

### Time budget of Bachelor and Master students

The time budget of (all) Bachelor students varies from less than 40 hours per week in Georgia, Lithuania, Bosnia-Herzegovina, and France to more than 60 hours per week in Poland and Armenia (Figure 6.5a). At the Bachelor level, taught studies are the single largest component of students' time budget in almost two thirds of the EUROSTUDENT countries.

- Of the remaining countries, personal study time makes up the single largest component of Bachelor students' time budget in Malta, Italy, Austria, Sweden, Norway, the Netherlands, and Denmark; whereas Bachelor students dedicate the largest share of their weekly time budget towards paid jobs in Poland, Estonia and Czech Republic (Figure 6.5a).

*At the Bachelor level, taught studies are the single largest component of students' time budget in the majority of countries*

Compared to Bachelor students, the total time budget of (all) Master students is higher in three quarters of the EUROSTUDENT countries (Figure 6.5b).

- This difference is at least five hours or more per week in Malta, Estonia, Hungary, Ireland, Norway, Montenegro, Romania, and France.
- In Poland, Russia, and Bosnia-Herzegovina the total time budget of Master students is less (by at least five hours per week) than that of Bachelor students.


*Master level students spend considerably less time on taught studies in all EUROSTUDENT countries*

Master students spend considerably less time on taught studies compared to Bachelor students. In almost 50 % of the EUROSTUDENT countries, Master students dedicate the largest share of their time budget towards personal studies. In more than one third of the countries, paid jobs make up the single largest component of students' time budget at the Master level whereas in Hungary, Slovakia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, and France taught studies comprise the single largest component of students' time budget.

Figure 6.5

**Time budget of all students by type of study programme**

Students' time budget by type of activity (in hours/week)

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, I.5. **No data:** LV, UA**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 3.13 How many hours do you spend on paid jobs in a typical week during this semester?, 3.14 How many hours do you spend in a typical week in taught courses and on personal study time?**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.**Time budget of students not living with parents by educational background and age groups**


The time budget of students without higher education background is greater than that of students with higher education background in the majority of countries, although this difference is marginal at less than five hours per week in all countries except Malta (Table A6.5).

- In Armenia, Denmark, France, Italy, Latvia, Montenegro, and Russia students with higher education background report an overall higher time budget compared to their peers without higher education background. Except in Denmark, Georgia, Montenegro, and Serbia students without higher education backgrounds spend more time on paid jobs than their counterparts (Table A6.5).

Figure 6.6

**Time spent by students not living with parents on study-related activities and paid jobs by age groups**

Time spent on study-related activities and paid jobs (in hours/week)

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, I.2. **No data:** UA; younger than 22 years: MT; at least 22 but younger than 25 years: MT.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 3.13 How many hours do you spend on paid jobs in a typical week during this semester?, 3.14 How many hours do you spend in a typical week in taught courses and on personal study time?**Notes:** Taught studies and personal study time are collectively referred to as study-related activities. In the above figure the coloured dots represent EURO-STUDENT countries.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

As in the case of employment rate, differences in time budget between Bachelor and Master students and students with and without high education backgrounds is related to the average age of students in these groups (>Chapter 4). Time spent on paid jobs increases with increasing age (Figure 6.6).

- The overall time budget of students who are at least 30 years old is substantially higher than the time budget of students who are younger than 22 years. In more than 40 % of the countries this difference is 10 hours or more (Figure 6.6 and Table A6.5).
- In all countries, students who are at least 30 years old spend considerably more time on paid jobs compared to students who are younger than 22 years (Table A6.5). Apart from Armenia, Denmark, Lithuania, and Poland this difference is at least 10 hours or more. In more than 40 % of the countries, students who are at least 30 years old spend more than 50 % of their time budget on paid jobs. In nine countries, students who are at least 30 years old spend more than 30 hours per week on paid jobs.

**In all countries, the overall time budget of students and the time spent on paid jobs in a typical study week increases with students' age**

**Time budget for study related activities by extent of paid employment**

To date, there are contradicting results on the relationship between number of hours spent towards paid employment and students' academic outcomes. Previous studies have concluded that working for a few hours per week may have beneficial effects on students' academic achievements.

**Increasing time spent on gainful employment is associated with a reduction in time for study-related activities as well as an overall increase in students' time budget**


Figure 6.7<sup>1</sup> shows the average time spent on study-related activities (Y-Axis) by extent of paid employment, i.e. students who do not work at all, and students who engage in

<sup>1</sup> Figure 6.7 is adapted from the 20<sup>th</sup> German social survey of the Deutsche Studentenwerk conducted by the HIS-Institute for Research on Higher Education and Science Studies (now DZHW).

Figure 6.7

**Time budget of all students for study-related activities by extent of paid employment**

Students' time budget by type of activity (in hours/week), cross country average (unweighted)

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, I.4. **No data:** RO, UA.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 3.13 How many hours do you spend on paid jobs in a typical week during this semester?, 3.14 How many hours do you spend in a typical week in taught courses and on personal study time?**Notes:** Taught studies and personal study time are collectively referred to as study-related activities.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

paid employment of one to five hours per week, six to 10 hours per week, 11–15 hours per week, and more than 15 hours per week (X-Axis).

- Across all EUROSTUDENT countries, students with no paid jobs spend on an (unweighted) average 38 hours per week on study-related activities. This consists of a total of 20 hours per week spent on taught studies (light blue area in Figure 6.7) and 18 hours per week dedicated towards personal study time (grey area).
- On a cross-country average, increasing time spent on gainful employment is associated with a reduction in time for study-related activities as evident from the decrease in the areas for study-related activities (Figure 6.7). In almost all EUROSTUDENT countries, students with no paid jobs spend relatively more time on study-related activities (Table A6.6). Students with gainful employment of 15 hours or more per week spend the least amount of time on study-related activities among the five groups. Compared to students with no paid jobs, students who work more than 15 hours per week seem to reduce their time spent on study-related activities by more than 15 hours per week in Switzerland, Italy, Malta, and Sweden.
- In all EUROSTUDENT countries, an increase in time spent on paid jobs is also associated with an increase in the overall time budget (Table A6.6). This suggests that the additional time students spend on paid jobs is balanced by cutting down on study-related activities as well as at the expense of students' leisure time.
- On an average, students who work more than 15 hours per week tend to reduce their time for taught studies more than their personal study time (Figure 6.7). In 70 % of the EUROSTUDENT countries, the decrease in time spent on taught studies is greater than the decrease in time spent on personal studies between no paid employment and more than 15 hours of paid employment per week (Table A6.6). This suggests that students who work more than 15 hours per week may opt for flexible study structures (either formally or de-facto part-time) (>Chapter 5) in order to balance work and studies.

## Discussion and policy considerations

Employment alongside higher education is a reality in many countries. In more than half of the EUROSTUDENT countries, at least 40 % of students engage in paid employment. Systematic differences in the employment rates between different student groups are apparent. Older students engage in paid employment more frequently compared to younger students. This supports the findings from previous studies on students' employment (Auers, Rostoks, & Smith, 2007; Beerkens, Mägi, & Lill, 2010).

Similar to students' employment rate, age is also related to students' overall time budget and its composition. As already found in the last round of EUROSTUDENT, older students have a higher overall time budget, and they tend to spend considerably more time on paid jobs compared to their younger peers. The time budget of older students also tends to comprise activities with less formal structure, i.e. personal studies and paid jobs rather than taught studies.

This suggests that in order to meet work and study demands, older students tend to opt for flexible study arrangements. In countries that offer part-time courses, a considerable majority of students who are 30 years or older are enrolled as part-time (>Chapter 5). Students opting for a de-facto part-time status are also common in many EUROSTUDENT countries (>Chapter 5). This means that even though students are registered as full-time students, they devote less than 20 hours per week on study-related activities. One way or the other, these students may be creating flexible study arrangements to meet their employment demands. The issue of students' employment alongside studies requires a systematic approach and structural changes at multiple levels. For instance, provision of flexible study arrangements and part-time courses would better enable certain student groups to balance their professional and educational demands (Beerkens, Mägi, & Lill, 2010).

At the same time, the results on students' employment also highlight the issue of funding opportunities especially for older students. Funding guidelines which are based on a more traditional expectation of students' use of time may not be suitable for older students as well as low intensity students and those without higher education background – basically, all students who do not conform to the 'traditional' definition of students (Schuetze & Slowey, 2002) and often appear to be dependent on their employment to finance their living. This may be due to different financial obligations such as a family to support, child care, or housing payments that these students need to finance through their employment (>Chapter 3, Chapter 4, Chapter 8). If adequate financial support is not available, these students will have to continue to work alongside their studies, possibly with negative impact on their success and progress.

The increasing diversity of students in the higher education systems therefore necessitates a review of already existing study structure, student support services and funding opportunities, making sure that they meet the needs and requirements of a diverse student body.

# Tables

Table A6.1

## Employment rate during term-time of students living with parents

Students' employment rate (in %)

Country	All students	Bachelor	Master	High intensity	Low intensity	With HE background	Without HE background	Delayed	At least 30 years
AM	25	23	45	18	33	25	25	42	58
AT	56	52	64	45	70	53	58	60	65
BA	22	22	25	18	23	22	22	20	6
CH	59	57	71	43	76	57	64	70	72
CZ	67	64	74	45	78	69	65	78	94
DE	60	58	64	51	79	59	62	63	72
DK	49	52	•	53	60	54	52	48	•
EE	59	55	78	48	75	61	57	64	87
FI	27	39	•	28	•	27	42	•	•
FR	41	40	63	35	45	42	40	47	46
GE	26	22	91	17	42	27	22	16	•
HR	45	43	58	36	50	42	49	67	78
HU	41	41	51	25	59	39	43	59	78
IE	80	80	77	80	83	78	82	86	85
IT	27	27	35	19	39	22	29	56	64
LT	23	22	35	19	39	22	29	•	•
LV	49	40	79	41	63	49	50	51	•
ME	50	45	77	32	62	50	51	64	82
MT	47	38	73	24	85	29	52	–	–
NL	79	79	70	71	81	77	81	75	69
NO	59	60	76	55	57	59	58	–	•
PL	63	61	72	42	75	61	66	–	63
RO	30	23	55	11	67	26	31	55	•
RS	22	21	26	19	30	25	19	29	50
RU	26	25	51	33	20	23	34	45	•
SE	48	52	49	43	59	44	55	56	•
SI	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
SK	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
UA	26	25	30	21	39	28	23	40	–

– no data • too few cases

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, H.1, H.2.

**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 3.9 Do you have a paid job during the current semester?

**Notes:** The categories 'working from time to time during the semester', 'working during the whole semester, less than five hours per week' and 'working during the whole semester, five hours or more per week' were aggregated to calculate the employment rate.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** DE, FR, LT.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

Table A6.2

**Employment rate during term-time of students not living with parents**

Students' employment rate (in %)

Country	All students	Bachelor	Master	High intensity	Low intensity	With HE background	Without HE background	Delayed
AM	18	16	30	12	•	18	19	16
AT	64	59	72	48	80	60	66	71
BA	21	21	26	11	34	23	20	51
CH	66	62	72	45	86	65	72	82
CZ	67	67	69	44	83	64	71	89
DE	58	55	71	47	78	58	59	65
DK	58	59	61	47	65	88	54	60
EE	67	64	81	51	80	65	70	80
FI	57	54	61	43	74	55	59	61
FR	42	39	58	33	52	42	43	56
GE	25	19	62	12	45	26	24	•
HR	43	40	61	33	63	39	46	73
HU	49	49	66	27	73	45	54	80
IE	85	83	89	84	90	84	85	90
IT	26	27	36	13	54	15	30	70
LT	21	18	39	15	32	20	21	35
LV	49	31	84	32	73	49	49	65
ME	52	47	82	33	68	55	48	63
MT	66	48	76	40	84	65	72	–
NL	75	75	73	60	83	73	78	87
NO	59	53	58	45	79	57	64	–
PL	65	59	74	46	79	63	65	–
RO	34	28	57	18	72	30	35	70
RS	24	22	30	16	38	28	21	37
RU	29	26	60	39	16	27	32	63
SE	53	51	52	34	79	50	59	64
SI	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
SK	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
UA	25	25	25	20	29	26	22	33

– no data • too few cases

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, H.1, H.2.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 3.9 Do you have a paid job during the current semester?**Notes:** The categories 'working from time to time during the semester', 'working during the whole semester, less than five hours per week' and 'working during the whole semester, five hours or more per week' were aggregated to calculate the employment rate.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** DE, FR, LT.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.



Table A6.3

**Students' motivation to work by age groups**

Share of all working students for whom the statement applies totally and mainly (in %)

Country	All students				Younger than 22 years				At least 30 years			
	To fund my living	To improve my living standard	To gain experience on the labour market	Because I have free time to spend	To fund my living	To improve my living standard	To gain experience on the labour market	Because I have free time to spend	To fund my living	To improve my living standard	To gain experience on the labour market	Because I have free time to spend
AM	49	65	67	31	43	66	67	31	65	67	57	26
AT	76	59	52	43	52	75	53	47	94	40	39	37
BA	34	71	65	32	17	66	61	39	76	84	69	29
CH	52	67	32	13	27	78	57	17	79	45	12	7
CZ	64	68	68	14	46	72	64	19	94	65	69	7
DE	59	75	51	–	39	84	45	–	88	50	43	–
DK	81	72	53	26	72	66	44	24	79	58	45	15
EE	76	76	67	21	64	71	62	21	86	78	57	15
FI	92	81	71	17	85	83	72	23	96	80	65	14
FR	47	74	71	18	33	74	69	24	86	64	67	7
GE	51	67	73	12	47	65	69	12	•	•	•	•
HR	67	67	57	16	58	63	52	18	90	82	54	7
HU	49	64	54	21	28	65	55	25	68	59	40	12
IE	84	67	49	12	76	58	48	13	92	81	53	11
IT	66	75	70	–	55	69	67	–	84	73	60	–
LT	75	69	67	27	58	89	64	38	89	48	51	10
LV	78	77	72	26	75	78	69	27	76	71	56	24
ME	37	76	74	13	31	76	74	16	54	74	60	7
MT	73	75	53	10	49	72	46	12	89	83	57	10
NL	66	65	56	24	52	72	55	28	86	47	48	8
NO	80	66	56	12	69	68	60	16	87	57	47	11
PL	72	75	63	37	62	74	60	38	58	72	57	60
RO	73	78	72	23	62	79	65	20	91	81	72	19
RS	35	74	62	16	34	77	61	21	31	75	62	5
RU	43	72	61	39	32	64	54	37	•	•	•	•
SE	65	71	56	18	35	69	65	27	88	73	44	11
SI	50	71	65	24	34	76	60	23	88	60	61	7
SK	–	83	55	16	–	82	48	14	–	84	59	15
UA	29	16	24	29	28	71	53	29	–	–	–	–

– no data • too few cases

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, H.8, H.10.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 3.9 Do you have a paid job during the current semester?, 3.10 To what extent do the following statements apply to your situation?**Notes:** Values shown are aggregated shares of the categories 'applies totally' and 'applies mainly'.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** AT.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

Table A6.4

**Students' assessment of extent of relationship between their field of study and employment activity**

Share of all working students with jobs (very) closely related to their field of study (in %)

Country	All students	Bachelor	Master	High intensity	Low intensity	Delayed	Dependent on family support	Dependent on own earnings	Dependent on public support
AM	45	42	65	48	–	59	–	–	–
AT	45	40	62	42	50	51	38	53	38
BA	28	29	32	29	40	55	26	41	•
CH	47	41	58	44	61	61	38	56	40
CZ	40	37	45	33	46	56	–	–	–
DE	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
DK	43	42	62	45	43	48	58	51	44
EE	52	46	64	52	54	59	49	55	50
FI	56	47	69	47	67	60	56	60	37
FR	41	27	50	46	38	43	38	50	26
GE	45	42	54	43	56	•	48	46	•
HR	32	31	36	29	37	51	24	51	27
HU	43	39	60	40	48	52	33	51	31
IE	36	27	65	28	52	50	23	45	21
IT	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
LT	45	39	60	51	47	55	43	48	•
LV	52	36	71	49	55	60	49	54	•
ME	44	39	61	44	46	37	33	53	•
MT	48	41	58	41	56	–	36	55	•
NL	36	32	54	32	44	59	29	51	26
NO	52	42	55	40	68	–	55	67	37
PL	32	26	39	36	35	–	23	34	–
RO	50	45	61	44	57	65	–	–	–
RS	32	29	42	28	47	25	29	40	•
RU	38	35	56	40	•	58	–	–	–
SE	50	41	55	34	61	53	53	62	35
SI	38	36	43	30	50	60	33	47	35
SK	29	25	37	23	34	45	23	33	•
UA	40	37	53	44	40	42	41	39	•

– no data • too few cases

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, H.11, H.12, H.13.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 3.9 Do you have a paid job during the current semester?, 3.11 How closely related is your job to the content of your study programme?**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

Table A6.5

**Time budget of students not living with parents by educational background and age groups**

Students' time budget by type of activity (in hours/week)

Country	With HE background			Without HE background			Younger than 22 years			At least 22 but younger than 25 years			At least 25 but younger than 30 years			At least 30 years		
	Taught studies	Personal study time	Paid jobs	Taught studies	Personal study time	Paid jobs	Taught studies	Personal study time	Paid jobs	Taught studies	Personal study time	Paid jobs	Taught studies	Personal study time	Paid jobs	Taught studies	Personal study time	Paid jobs
AM	31	28	4	27	27	7	30	27	4	33	25	7	23	29	5	29	37	8
AT	12	20	11	12	18	15	16	19	4	14	21	9	11	19	15	9	14	24
BA	19	13	3	20	14	3	21	15	1	19	14	2	19	12	5	13	8	24
CH	19	16	9	18	14	13	26	15	3	22	16	7	18	15	12	14	13	17
CZ	16	10	14	14	9	19	20	10	7	17	10	12	11	10	23	5	8	38
DE	18	18	7	19	17	8	22	16	4	19	17	7	16	20	10	14	17	15
DK	15	17	7	16	16	6	18	15	5	17	15	7	13	19	7	14	19	6
EE	16	16	15	16	14	16	19	13	7	15	16	13	13	18	20	13	14	29
FI	16	16	10	16	15	13	22	13	4	18	15	8	15	17	12	12	16	18
FR	21	16	4	20	14	4	23	14	1	19	16	5	16	16	9	13	16	13
GE	18	14	8	19	14	7	20	15	4	16	11	16	13	11	23	11	15	25
HR	19	19	9	19	17	12	22	19	4	17	19	9	16	19	19	11	14	36
HU	21	14	12	21	13	17	25	15	4	22	14	8	18	12	24	17	11	34
IE	18	16	10	18	16	12	20	14	5	19	20	8	18	16	14	15	17	16
IT	19	25	4	17	22	8	21	25	1	19	25	4	13	21	12	10	16	25
LT	18	17	4	18	16	3	20	15	2	16	18	6	14	16	5	16	17	6
LV	18	15	15	18	15	15	19	16	6	17	14	21	15	13	31	15	11	32
ME	14	16	16	16	14	14	17	16	7	14	14	14	14	15	21	12	11	27
MT	8	15	24	14	20	24	–	–	–	–	–	–	14	20	22	10	16	31
NL	14	18	9	12	18	14	16	17	6	15	19	8	12	20	13	8	18	24
NO	12	19	13	12	15	19	16	18	7	14	19	10	12	21	13	8	13	26
PL	21	13	27	22	14	29	21	14	25	21	13	29	23	14	31	23	12	34
RO	18	15	10	18	13	13	19	14	5	18	13	9	16	13	19	16	12	32
RS	19	17	7	19	19	5	20	18	4	18	18	4	18	19	10	19	16	16
RU	25	14	6	23	12	8	26	13	4	22	14	11	18	9	14	9	1	26
SE	12	24	8	10	24	12	16	23	2	13	25	5	12	26	8	7	22	20
SI	20	19	11	19	15	16	23	17	5	20	17	12	14	16	18	16	18	33
SK	19	14	10	18	14	13	21	15	5	18	14	9	13	11	27	11	10	36
UA	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

– no data

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, I.2.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 3.13 How many hours do you spend on paid jobs in a typical week during this semester?, 3.14 How many hours do you spend in a typical week in taught courses and on personal study time?**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

Table A6.6

**Time budget of all students for study-related activities by extent of paid employment**

Students' time budget by type of activity (in hours/week)

Country	0 hours of paid employment			1–5 hours of paid employment			6–10 hours of paid employment			11–15 hours of paid employment			More than 15 hours of paid employment		
	Taught studies	Personal study time	Paid jobs	Taught studies	Personal study time	Paid jobs	Taught studies	Personal study time	Paid jobs	Taught studies	Personal study time	Paid jobs	Taught studies	Personal study time	Paid jobs
AM	30	27	0	29	25	4	26	22	8	30	27	13	24	21	38
AT	15	21	0	14	20	4	13	21	9	12	20	14	9	14	31
BA	20	15	0	19	15	3	18	13	9	18	14	14	15	12	32
CH	24	17	0	22	14	3	20	14	8	17	14	13	13	10	26
CZ	20	11	0	19	10	3	18	10	9	16	9	14	10	8	33
DE	21	19	0	19	18	4	18	17	8	17	16	13	14	15	24
DK	16	18	0	16	17	4	15	18	8	15	15	13	13	14	22
EE	19	17	0	16	18	3	17	16	9	17	20	14	13	14	36
FI	19	18	0	17	15	3	18	16	9	18	14	14	10	13	31
FR	22	15	0	20	13	3	18	13	8	17	12	13	12	12	28
GE	19	14	0	18	13	3	19	11	8	17	11	14	15	11	35
HR	20	18	0	19	19	3	19	19	9	18	18	14	15	14	34
HU	24	15	0	23	15	3	22	13	9	21	14	14	16	10	35
IE	20	18	0	19	17	4	19	15	8	20	13	13	14	13	31
IT	18	24	0	16	22	4	15	21	8	16	21	14	10	18	31
LT	20	17	0	16	14	3	18	15	9	10	11	13	16	16	36
LV	20	17	0	21	16	4	20	15	9	21	16	14	16	12	34
ME	17	16	0	18	14	3	17	13	8	12	11	14	12	12	39
MT	21	28	0	19	29	3	19	23	9	17	20	14	12	13	35
NL	16	20	0	16	17	3	16	17	8	15	17	13	10	16	28
NO	14	21	0	14	23	3	14	21	8	14	17	13	9	13	30
PL	24	15	0	22	14	3	20	12	9	22	12	14	19	11	33
RO	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
RS	19	19	0	18	16	4	18	18	8	21	19	14	17	15	33
RU	26	13	0	24	16	2	23	11	6	24	14	11	19	9	33
SE	14	27	0	14	24	3	12	24	8	9	24	13	5	17	31
SI	22	18	0	20	18	3	23	18	9	19	16	14	16	15	31
SK	20	15	0	19	13	4	19	14	9	18	13	14	14	10	34
UA	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

– no data

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, I.4.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 3.13 How many hours do you spend on paid jobs in a typical week during this semester?, 3.14 How many hours do you spend in a typical week in taught courses and on personal study time?**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.



## Chapter 7

# Students' resources

### Key findings

- **Level of student income:** The magnitude of students' total monthly income, including transfers in kind, varies greatly between countries. In Norway, Sweden, and Switzerland, students who are not living with parents have more than 2,000 Euro per month, while students in Armenia, Georgia, and Serbia receive less than 400 Euro in the same time span.<sup>1</sup>
- **Concentration of student income:** Within the national student populations, the distribution of total monthly income can diverge considerably. In Estonia, Poland, and Russia, the income of students who are not living with parents varies greatly within the student population. Student income is rather evenly distributed e.g. in Austria, Denmark, Germany, and the Netherlands.
- **Composition of student income:** On aggregate across countries, the students' families/partners provide about half of students' total monthly income. Students themselves earn about one third of their income through gainful employment. Public support accounts roughly for one tenth of students' means. The rest is provided by other sources. These results hold for both groups, students who are living with parents and those who are not.
- **Dependency on a specific income source:** Some students have an unbalanced composition of income and depend on one specific source. Of students who are living away from their parents, the highest total income is, on cross-country average, available to those who depend on gainful employment. Students who depend on family support receive the second highest total monthly income. The lowest average income is available to students depending on public support.
- **Earnings by educational background:** On average across countries, students without higher education (HE) background rely to a higher degree on self-earned income (37 % of total monthly income) than their fellow students with HE background (32 %).
- **Public support by educational background:** For students who are not living with parents, those without HE background benefit to a greater extent from public support than students with HE background. On cross-country average, 37 % of students without HE background receive direct state support, whereas the recipient quota among their counterparts is 33 %. In 16 out of 22 countries, students without HE background receive more public support in absolute and relative terms than students with HE background.

<sup>1</sup> These values do not take into account differences in purchasing power.

## Main issues

Participation in HE is a period of a few years which may cause a substantial financial burden for students. On the one hand, studies may increase students' expenses, e.g. due to the necessity of moving out of the parents' home and the payment of one's own living and study-related costs. On the other hand, it may be more difficult for students to generate income, especially as their availability for the labour market is limited due to the time they need to spend on study-related activities. Therefore, sufficient funds available to students can be viewed as a necessary financial condition for taking up and successfully completing HE. The ministers responsible for HE in the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) have repeatedly referred to this point and its meaning for developing the social dimension of HE (London Communiqué, 2007; Bucharest Communiqué, 2012). This chapter investigates different aspects of the income situation of students that are also relevant for assessing the status quo of the social dimension in the EHEA:

- What is the average amount of income students receive?
- How diverse is the distribution and concentration of income within the national student populations?
- What are the sources that students utilize to receive income?
- Are there differences with regard to the use of certain income sources and their contributions to students' total income between different student groups?

## Methodological and conceptual notes

According to the EUROSTUDENT Conventions, four sources of student income are distinguished. The respective categories are named i) family/partner contributions, ii) public sources, iii) self-earned income and iv) other income.

### Family/partner contributions

This source of student income refers to support that students receive from their parents, other relatives, or their partner. It comprises on the one hand disposable income such as cash/money transfers which students can freely use for monthly spending (= transfers in cash). On the other hand, it contains so-called "transfers in kind". Transfers in kind are students' living and study-related costs that are paid by the students' parents, other relatives, or their partner. The key criterion for transfers in kind is that the payments go directly to the students' creditors, i.e. the respective money is intangible for the students. The concept of transfers in cash and in kind is used in order to take account of the different forms of support students receive from their social environment and to capture by this means the overall picture of the students' financial situation. Data on transfers in kind are included in the category "family/partner" and were collected irrespective of whether students are living with parents or not.

### Public sources

This category comprises payments which students receive directly from the state, usually because of their student status. It includes on the one hand grants and scholarships (= non-repayable support) and on the other hand loans which may be subject to inter-

est or not (= repayable support). Support from all possible institutional levels (i.e. federal level, province, and municipality) as well as from the HE institutions (HEIs) is taken into account.

### Self-earned income

The category “self-earned income” covers students' income which is generated through gainful employment. Income from both current employment as well as from previous employment (= savings) is taken into account. With respect to income from previous employment, only the average amount students use per month to cover their costs of living and studying is considered.

### Other income

“Other income” is a residual category which collects a plethora of income items from either private or public sources that are not assigned to one of the other categories mentioned above. Student income from other private sources can be, for instance, grants and loans from private companies. Income from other public sources can be, e.g., housing benefits or child benefits for students.

In this context, the focus of the EUROSTUDENT project is to describe the resources of the national student populations. With respect to public support, it is intended to cover the different items of student funding, while it is not intended to depict a country's institutional support system, i.e. the funding of HEIs by the state. However, there may be cases where the distinction between student funding and institutional support is not so obvious. In Georgia, for instance, students who are obliged to pay tuition fees may receive non-repayable public support, e.g. based on good performance or social need. The state, however, does not pay this kind of support directly to the students, but to the HEIs instead. Although students have reported this as one of their income items, it has not been taken into account in the EUROSTUDENT data as the assignment to either student funding or institutional support was not possible without further analyses. This should be kept in mind when assessing the financial data for Georgia.

### Currency amounts

This chapter contains several figures in which the magnitude of student income is displayed. Although most of the EUROSTUDENT countries are not (yet) part of the Euro area,<sup>2</sup> the Euro has been used as a common currency to ensure data comparability. To this end, the values which were reported by the non-Euro countries in national currency were converted into Euro values. The respective currency conversion factors that have been applied are based on exchange rates as reported by the European Central Bank (ECB), Eurostat, and the internet portal OANDA (European Central Bank, 2014a; Eurostat, 2014c; OANDA, 2014). For conversion, half-yearly average exchange rate values were used for the period in which the respective EUROSTUDENT countries executed their field phase. When assessing the magnitude of student income in Euro values, it should be kept in mind that the level of income for the non-Euro countries can be considerably influenced by the exchange rate utilized.

<sup>2</sup> This holds for Armenia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, Denmark, Georgia, Hungary, Latvia and Lithuania (both at the time of the survey), Norway, Poland, Romania, Russia, Serbia, Sweden, Switzerland, the Czech Republic, and the Ukraine.



## Strengths and shortcomings of EUROSTUDENT data

Student income derives from a variety of public and private sources. Official statistics are usually not able to reflect all these income items. This already applies to the reporting of public support, especially when it is granted from various institutional levels. Especially in countries where students can receive public support directly from the HEI they attend, data on this sometimes cannot be included in the country's official statistics on public support. Therefore, data from a student survey like EUROSTUDENT have an advantage over official statistics. This advantage of students' self-reported data can lose at least some of its importance, however, if the students do not have an accurate overview of their financial situation and are only able to provide a "rough estimate".

## Notes on national surveys

In a few countries, deviations from the EUROSTUDENT survey conventions can be found.

- Austria: For the questions on student income, the Austrian questionnaire did not differentiate between all items in the same way as the EUROSTUDENT core questionnaire.
- Denmark: Due to problems with the combination of data from the survey population of national students and the survey population of international students, only data from national students are included for calculating the average income in figures 7.1, 7.4, 7.6 and tables A7.1, and A7.2.
- Georgia: Payments of the state to HEIs which are meant to cover students' tuition fees are not taken into account although they were reported by the students as part of their income (see section above).
- Romania: The data on public support contain both payments from the state to students and to HEIs. Since the latter is a violation of the EUROSTUDENT Conventions affecting all data on students' total income, the Romanian data on student income were excluded from this report. However, the interested reader may view these data in the Data Reporting Module ([> DRM](#)).
- The Netherlands: For the subtopic "distribution and concentration of total monthly income of students not living with parents" the data cleaning was stricter than laid down in the EUROSTUDENT project conventions.

## Data and interpretation

### Income of all students

*Students' average income per month is comparatively high in Norway, Switzerland, and Sweden*

As a student's financial need is also influenced by the type of housing, analyses differentiate between students living with parents and those not living with parents. Data on the income situation of students who are not living with parents are presented in the following (Figure 7.1). On average across all countries displayed in the figure, students' monthly income amounts to 885 Euro.

- Students' income is above the international average in Norway, Switzerland, Sweden, Finland, the Netherlands, Denmark, Malta, Austria, Ireland, France, and Germany. In the remaining 15 countries, the income values are below average.
- In Norway, Switzerland, and Sweden, students' average monthly income is particularly high, with values above 2,000 Euro.<sup>3</sup>
- In Georgia, Serbia, and Armenia, students receive less than 400 Euro per month.


<sup>3</sup> Please see the note on currency amounts.

Figure 7.1

**Magnitude of students' income – students not living with parents**

Total monthly income including transfers in kind

Income in Euro (arithm. mean)

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, G.1. **No data:** RO, RU, UA.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 3.6 What is the average monthly amount at your disposal from the following sources during the current semester?, 3.7 What are your average expenses for the following items during the current semester?**Notes:** Expenses of parents/partner/others in favour of the students were used to calculate transfers in kind.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** AT, DK, GE.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

There are large differences between the countries in the magnitude of students' total income. These differences may be influenced by several factors, such as differences in the students' employment behaviour, the countries' overall price level, the availability and magnitude of public and private funding sources, the cost structures in HE, the way cost-sharing in HE between the private and the public sector is organized (Orr, Wespel, & Usher, 2014), and – for the non-Euro countries – by the exchange rate for the Euro. In countries with a high GDP per capita – such as those at the left end of the x-axis (in Figure 7.1) – the overall price level is also usually markedly higher than in countries with a low GDP per capita.<sup>4</sup> This will affect any minimum amount of income students need to cover their expenses. In this respect, there are also indications that the students' expenses in the high-GDP countries are especially driven by their living costs: In Finland, Norway, Sweden, and Switzerland, students who are not living with parents spend on cross-country average 94 % of total expenses on living costs, whereas this share amounts only to 82 % across Armenia, Georgia, Serbia, and Slovakia (>Chapter 8).<sup>5</sup>

For students who are living with their parents, some differences can be observed in comparison to their peers who are living away from their parents (Table A7.1). In almost all countries, the total income of students living with parents is lower than for students not living with parents. Only in Latvia, Montenegro, and Slovakia, is the income of students living with parents higher than for their counterparts not living with parents. These countries have in common that provisions from family/partner are higher for

<sup>4</sup> A comparison of the countries' price levels of final consumption by private households with the average value of the EU-28 countries provides, inter alia, the following results for the year 2013 (values rounded): EU-28 = 100, Norway = 155, Switzerland = 156, Sweden = 130, Finland = 124, Bosnia-Herzegovina = 53, Poland = 57, Slovakia = 71, Serbia = 54 (Eurostat, 2014a).

<sup>5</sup> Based on the EUROSTUDENT Conventions, the category living costs comprises expenses for accommodation, food, transportation, communication, health, childcare, debt payment, social and leisure activities, and other regular living costs (e.g. for clothing).

students who are living with parents than for their peers who moved away from their parents. On cross-country average, the total monthly income of students living with parents amounts to 646 Euro.

A comparison of students' income by type of study programme shows that Master students usually have higher incomes than their peers in Bachelor programmes. On cross-country average, Bachelor students living with parents have a total monthly income of 637 Euro, whereas Master students receive 719 Euro. Bachelor students who are not living with parents have a total monthly income of 833 Euro and their fellow students in Master programmes 976 Euro (Table A7.2). Exceptions to this pattern are Finland and Sweden with respect to students who are living with parents. For students who are not living with parents the pattern cannot be observed for Armenia, the Czech Republic, and Sweden. In all these countries, Master students have lower incomes than their counterparts in Bachelor programmes.

### Distribution and concentration of students' income

A student body may be more or less homogenous in financial terms. In order to view the distribution of income levels between students within a country, every student's income can be ranked between the lowest and the highest levels and then ascribed to a decile. For students who are not living with parents, the difference in income levels between three income groups are highlighted for each country (Figure 7.2). These income groups are the first 20% of income receivers (2<sup>nd</sup> decile), the median income receiver(s), and 80% of the income receivers (8<sup>th</sup> decile).

## 7

*In Malta, Russia, Armenia, and the Czech Republic, the income distribution among students not living with parents is rather unbalanced*


The 2<sup>nd</sup> decile, for instance, states that the “poorest” 20% of the student body receive an income which does not exceed a certain amount of Euro; the same holds – with the necessary changes – for the other cut-off points (median and 8<sup>th</sup> decile). Large differences between the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> decile indicate a quite unbalanced income distribution. In turn, if this difference is quite small, income is more evenly distributed among students. Data are presented using Euro values (chart a) and as a percentage of deviation from the median income (chart b) in order to facilitate a cross-country comparison.

■ In Malta, Russia, Armenia, and the Czech Republic, the relative difference between the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> decile is rather high. In Armenia, for instance, those 20% of students who belong to the top income group (i.e. those who are beyond the 8<sup>th</sup> decile) have at least 133% more income than the student(s) with the median income. Those 20% of students who are in the lowest income groups shown here (up to 2<sup>nd</sup> decile) have at least 52% less than the median income. In the other three countries mentioned above, these differences are very pronounced as well: Malta (+98% vs. –55%), Russia (+98% vs. –51%), and the Czech Republic (+102% vs. –44%). This indicates a rather unbalanced income distribution among students in those countries.

■ In Austria, Denmark, and Germany, the relative difference between the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> decile is quite low. In Denmark, the 20% top income receivers of students have at least 25% more income compared to the median; the “poorest” 20% of students have at least 22% less than the median income. That means in those countries, total monthly income is rather evenly distributed among students.

Figure 7.2

## Distribution of students' income by income decile – students not living with parents



Data source: EUROSTUDENT V, G.5. No data: NO, RO, UA.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 3.6 What is the average monthly amount at your disposal from the following sources during the current semester?, 3.7 What are your average expenses for the following items during the current semester?

Notes: Expenses of parents/partner/others in favour of the students were used to calculate transfers in kind.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions: GE, NL.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: DE, GE, IT.

A compact indicator which complements the analysis of income distribution is the Gini coefficient. It is a measure that highlights the analysis of the concentration of income using a single value for the whole income distribution. The Gini coefficient can take on values between 0 and 1. If there were no concentration of income at all (i.e. each income receiver had the same amount of income), the value of the Gini coefficient would be 0. In case of maximum concentration (i.e. only one person receiving all income) the Gini coefficient would be equal to 1. That means the higher the concentration of income (i.e. the higher the differences between low and high incomes), the higher the value of the Gini coefficient. The results of this analysis are shown subsequently (Figure 7.3).


*In Austria, Denmark, the Netherlands, and Germany, the concentration of students' income is rather low*

Figure 7.3

**Concentration of students' income – students not living with parents**

Gini coefficient based on total monthly income including transfers in kind

Value of Gini coefficient

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, G.5. **No data:** AM, NO, RO, UA.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 3.6 What is the average monthly amount at your disposal from the following sources during the current semester?, 3.7 What are your average expenses for the following items during the current semester?**Notes:** Expenses of parents/partner/others in favour of the students were used to calculate transfers in kind.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** GE, NL.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

- In Russia, Estonia, and Poland, the level of income concentration is rather high with values of at least 0.40.
- The distribution of student income is quite balanced and, therefore, shows a rather low concentration (values below 0.30) in Bosnia-Herzegovina, France, Slovenia, Austria, Denmark, the Netherlands, and especially in Germany.


A high degree of financial heterogeneity of a national student body can be the result of the interplay of various factors. Some of these influential factors could be the students' socio-economic background (low vs. high social background), the existence of dependents (students with children vs. students without children), the mode of study (full-time vs. part-time studies) in conjunction with employment, and the effects of the student public support system (with support items that either increase or reduce socio-economic disparities). Some degree of financial diversity within the student body is certainly unavoidable as there are groups of students with diverse needs which cause different financial requirements (e.g. students with children vs. students without children). A high degree of financial dissimilarity could imply, however, that students have access to different income sources which affect their studies in different ways.<sup>6</sup> In this case, students have diverse study framework conditions which could affect the duration and success of their studies. The "risk" of highly different study framework conditions within a student population is higher, the higher the degree of financial heterogeneity is.

<sup>6</sup> In a simplified example: "Wealthy" students may receive a large share of their income from their parents, whereas "poorer" students may have to generate their income mainly by gainful employment. This would have different implications for the students' time budgets (>Chapter 6).

Figure 7.4

**Composition of students' income – students not living with parents**

Total monthly income including transfers in kind



**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, G.1. **No data:** RO, RU, UA. **Too few cases:** Public support: GE.

**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 3.6 What is the average monthly amount at your disposal from the following sources during the current semester?, 3.7 What are your average expenses for the following items during the current semester?

**Notes:** Expenses of parents/partner/others in favour of the students were used to calculate transfers in kind.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** AT, DK, GE.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

**The composition of students' income**

Where do students' means actually come from? Students usually receive their income from different sources. The above figure provides data on the composition of students' total monthly income (Figure 7.4).

Across all countries, students' families/partners provide on average 47 % of students' income. Students' own contribution to their income by gainful employment amounts to 35 % on average. The public sector provides 11 % of student income by providing grants/scholarships and loans. Other income sources make up 7 %, on aggregate, of students' total monthly income. On this aggregated measure, the private sector (i.e. the students themselves and their families/partners) provides more than four fifths of student income, while the public sector accounts for about one tenth.<sup>7</sup> On this rough measure, the European student funding systems seem to broadly follow the subsidiarity principle: Only when the private sector has exhausted all means to finance students in HE does the public sector step into the breach.

**Across the EUROSTUDENT countries, students and their families/partners provide on average more than four fifths of students' total income**

Looking at the data on a less aggregated level, the following characteristics can be observed for the countries:

■ In 15 EUROSTUDENT countries, provisions from family/partner are the main source

<sup>7</sup> It must be stated, however, that the category "public sources" may not cover all contributions of the state to student funding. On the one hand, some items of public support such as housing benefits for students are reported in the category "other". On the other hand, the provisions from family/partner for the students may contain means which the family or partner has received from the state beforehand (e.g. in Germany and Austria, the students' parents may receive child benefits for their collegiate children, and the parents in turn may pass on this support to their children). In such cases, the share of public support would be underestimated.

of student income (i.e. the income source with the highest share in total income). This group of countries encompasses the South-Eastern European countries (Serbia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Montenegro,), a number of Central European countries (Croatia, Slovakia, Lithuania, Latvia, Hungary, Germany, Slovenia) as well as Armenia, Georgia, Italy, France, and Ireland. In most of these countries, the share of family/partner contributions accounts for more than 50 % of total income.

- There are 10 countries in which students' self-earned income provides the highest share in total income. This is true for most of the Nordic countries (Finland, Norway, and Sweden), Switzerland, Austria, the Czech Republic, Malta, the Netherlands, Poland, and Estonia. The respective share is above 50 % in half of these countries (the Czech Republic, Malta, Poland, Finland, and Estonia).
- Only for students in Denmark is public support the dominating source of income (i.e. the income source with the highest share in total income) with a share of more than 50 %.
- There is no country in which the residual category "other" provides the highest share in total income.

With respect to the differences between the countries in the magnitude of income, which were mentioned before (Figure 7.1), it is striking that in the countries with the highest income levels (Norway, Switzerland, Sweden, and Finland) self-earned income is the main source of income. For the countries with comparatively low income levels (Slovakia, Georgia, Serbia, and Armenia), provisions from family/partner are clearly the dominating source of income, providing more than half of the students' total income.

It might be expected that the composition of student income also explains the degree of income concentration. A simple data analysis provides no indication, however, that e.g. the main source of student income is clearly related to the level of income concentration. This may be taken as a hint for the absence of a simple monocausal explanation for the grouping of the countries which became apparent before (Figure 7.3). Instead, an in-depth analysis on the heterogeneity of the student body seems necessary in order to identify the reasons for a certain degree of concentration of student income.

For students who are living with parents, some differences can be observed in the EUROSTUDENT countries in comparison to their peers who are living away from their parents (Table A7.1). The composition of income differs slightly on aggregate: The share of family/partner contributions is 50 %, self-earned income 33 %, public support 11 %, and other sources 6 %. That means on a highly aggregated level, students who are living with parents receive a bit more support from family/partner, slightly less income from gainful employment, the same share of public support, and marginally less income from other sources.

There are also differences in the composition of student income by students' education background. For students who are not living with parents, those without HE background receive across all countries comparatively less income from family/partner than their counterparts with HE background (44 % vs. 51 % of total monthly income). The former group receives marginally more public support (12 % vs. 11 %), and it has higher earnings (37 % vs. 32 %). Other sources of income provide 7 % of total income for both groups (Table A7.3 & A7.4).



When looking at the income structure of Bachelor and Master students who are not living with parents, it can be stated that across all countries, Bachelor students receive 49 % of their total income from family/partner, 31 % from gainful employment, 13 % from public sources, and 7 % from other sources. Master students receive fewer contributions from their families/partners (40 %). Self-earned income is clearly of higher importance for Master students as it amounts to 43 % of total income. Furthermore, they receive less public support (10 %) and other sources provide the same share of income (7 %) compared to Bachelor students (>DRM). In order to reflect upon the differences in the magnitude and composition of income between the two groups it may be helpful to look at students' age. Across the EUROSTUDENT countries, the average age of Bachelor students is 24 years and that of Master students is 27 years (>Chapter 4). With advancing age, students tend more towards living with their partner and having children; both of which may cause additional financial needs (>Chapter 9). In this context it should be also noted that with rising age, students tend not to live in student accommodation anymore, which turns out to be the cheapest form of housing outside the parental home (>Chapter 8 & 9). Furthermore, the preference intensity for improving one's own standard of living or maintaining it (e.g. for students who used to work full-time before taking up studies) may grow with age. Therefore, Master students may have additional/higher financial needs than their younger peers in Bachelor programmes. One way to meet these extra needs is to increase one's own income through (more) gainful employment. In fact, EUROSTUDENT aggregate data clearly indicate that with advancing age the share of self-earned income in total income increases; this holds for students living with parents and even more so for students who are not living with parents (>DRM).

### Income of students depending on a specific income source

The data in Figure 7.4 gave an overview of the income structure of the student body per country. Despite the fact that, on average, there is only one main source of income within each national student body, there are also individual groups of students within a country which differ with regard to their dependency on an income source. The income situation of students not living with parents who depend on one specific source is looked at in the following (Figure 7.5).

According to the EUROSTUDENT Conventions, a student is depending on an income source if the respective source provides more than 50 % of total monthly income (including transfers in kind). Again, three sources are differentiated, which are considered to be the most important ones: "family support", "own earnings", and "public support". There are clear differences between the student groups depending on the different sources. Across all countries displayed in the figure, students who depend on gainful employment receive on average a total income (from all sources) of 1,197 Euro per month. If students depend on family support they have a mean income of 959 Euro and those who depend on public support receive 607 Euro per month. On a more disaggregated level, this pattern is even clearer:

- Out of 25 countries for which data on at least two income groups are available, students who depend on own earnings have the highest income in 21 countries.
- Only in Norway, Denmark, Malta, and Montenegro, it is students who are depending on family support who reach the highest income level.

*To students depending on public support the lowest income is available on cross-country average, when compared to their peers depending on family support or own earnings*




Figure 7.5

**Magnitude of students' income by dependency on income source – students not living with parents**

Total monthly income including transfers in kind of students dependent on an income source

Income in Euro (arithm. mean)



**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, G.3 **No data:** RO, RU, UA; students dependent on public support: PL. **Too few cases:** Students dependent on own earnings: AM; students dependent on public support: AM, CZ, GE, MT.

**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 3.6 What is the average monthly amount at your disposal from the following sources during the current semester?, 3.7 What are your average expenses for the following items during the current semester?

**Notes:** Expenses of parents/partner/others in favour of the students were used to calculate transfers in kind. Values above the country abbreviations present the income of students dependent on family support.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** AT, GE.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

- In no country do students with a dependency on public support achieve the highest income. On the contrary: Out of 21 countries for which data on all three income groups are available, there are 20 countries in which students with a dependency on public support have the least income out of the three student groups. Only in Estonia it is students who depend on family support who have the lowest income.

At first glance, the data suggest that students depending on public support are generally worse off than their peers who depend on another income source. However, there may be some fundamental differences in the living situation between the three groups that could explain (and perhaps justify) different levels of income. Students dependent on own earnings, for instance, have a much higher average age (27 years) than their peers who are dependent on public support (22 years) (>DRM). It was already pointed out that older students may have additional/higher financial needs than their younger fellow students due to e.g. living with partner/children. When looking at the housing situation of students who depend on an income source, it is also striking that among students with a dependency on public support the share of those living in a student accommodation is way above average (>Chapter 9); at the same time, student accommodation is the cheapest form of housing when living away from parents (>Chapter 8). Against this background, a lower income level for younger students – that is mainly financed by the state – need not necessarily be insufficient.


There is one potential problem, however, that is common to all three student groups: The degree of dependency on an income source tells something about the risk students are exposed to. The higher the share of a specific source in total income, the higher is

Figure 7.6

**Importance of gainful employment by educational background – students not living with parents**

Self-earned income as share of total monthly income including transfers in kind

Self-earned income in %

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, G.1, G.2. **No data:** RO, RU, UA.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 3.6 What is the average monthly amount at your disposal from the following sources during the current semester?, 3.7 What are your average expenses for the following items during the current semester?**Notes:** Expenses of parents/partner/others in favour of the students were used to calculate transfers in kind. Values above the country abbreviations present the percentage for all students.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** DK, GE.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

the students' dependency not only on the availability of the source over time, but also on its sufficiency to cover (most of) the necessary expenses.<sup>8</sup> In case the funding source runs dry, a quick and sufficient substitution may not always be possible. In general, it is an important task of politics to regularly review the availability and sufficiency of income for students (e.g. by official statistics or student surveys) – not only, but especially for students who depend on public support.

### The importance of gainful employment

As mentioned above, students' gainful employment is the second most important source on aggregate across countries. Are there any differences in the importance of self-earned income by students' education background? A comparison of the shares of self-earned income in total monthly income for students with and without HE background who are living away from their parents is presented above (Figure 7.6). It indicates that students without HE background rely to a higher extent on this source than students with HE background. Across all countries, self-earned income makes up on average 37 % of total income of students without HE background. For students with HE background, only 32 % of this source goes into the composition of their total income.

- In 20 countries, students without HE background have a higher share of self-earned income than their fellow students with HE background. Rather high differences in the shares between the two student groups can be found in Switzerland (students without HE background: + 12 percentage points), Austria (+ 11 percentage points),

**Across EURO-STUDENT countries, students without HE background receive on average 37 % of total income from gainful employment, while it is 32 % for those with HE background**

<sup>8</sup> In some countries, there are groups of students for whom the degree of dependency on one income source is higher than 90 % of total monthly income (>DRM).

Slovenia, and the Netherlands (in both countries: + 16 percentage points), and Italy (+ 17 percentage points).

- In Malta, Latvia, Lithuania, Denmark, Georgia, and Serbia, the basic pattern described above cannot be observed. In these countries, students with HE background have a higher share of self-earned income.

What are the reasons for the higher importance of job-income for students without HE background in most countries? When looking at the income structure of the two groups, it can be stated that students without HE background receive less shares of support from their family/partner than their peers whose parents have acquired HE (on aggregate: 44 % vs. 51 %). Furthermore, students without HE background receive, at least on cross-country average, only a marginally higher share of public support (12 % vs. 11 %) (> [DRM](#)). Therefore, it seems that the former group needs to fill their income gap – which is caused by less family support – by higher earnings. This conclusion would also be backed by data on the students' motivation to work (> [Chapter 6](#)). Working students were asked about their different motivations for taking up gainful employment. For the response item “I work to fund my living” 67 % of students without HE background reported that this applies mainly or totally to their situation. For students with HE background, the share amounts only to 57 %.

A small extent of the variation in income shares between the two student groups in most countries may be related to student age. As explained before, older students usually have a stronger reliance on paid work than younger students, which may be caused by different/additional needs of older students that are more expensive. The age difference between the two student groups, however, is only small. Students with HE background are 24 years old and their fellow students without HE background are on average 25 years old. However, the age profile of the latter group is more disparate (see the standard deviations) and in some countries, the age difference is more pronounced (> [Chapter 3](#)).


Based on the data at hand, it is not possible to judge whether the social difference in job earnings could be reduced through provisions from family/partner and the state at a higher level. There is, however, a clear and simple consequence for the students' time budget. If students (have to) spend time on paid work this time is not available for study-related activities anymore. This may put the students affected at a disadvantage compared to their peers who (have to) work less or do not work at all. Across the EUROSTUDENT countries, students without HE background spend 12 hours per week on gainful employment, whereas their fellow students with HE background spend only ten hours per week on this purpose. This difference is more pronounced, however, in individual countries (e.g. in the Czech Republic, Norway, and Slovenia, the difference amounts to five hours or more per week) (> [Chapter 6](#)).

### The importance of contributions from family/partner

The importance of provisions from family/partner for the students' budget has been examined in Figure 7.4. But while the respective data have been calculated across valid cases of recipients and non-recipients of family/partner contributions, the following analysis takes only the recipients of this source into account (Figure 7.7). This allows a better insight into the income situation of the students concerned. The chart

Figure 7.7

## Recipients of family/partner contributions and importance of income source – students not living with parents



**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, G.6. **No data:** CZ, RO, RU, UA.

**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 3.6 What is the average monthly amount at your disposal from the following sources during the current semester?, 3.7 What are your average expenses for the following items during the current semester?

**Notes:** Expenses of parents/partner/others in favour of the students were used to calculate transfers in kind.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** GE.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

combines the share of recipients of family/partner contributions among students not living with parents (on the x-axis) with the relative importance of this source in the recipients' total monthly income (on the y-axis). Based on the country average, four groups of countries can be distinguished.

- In the countries positioned in the upper left and the bottom right quadrants, one characteristic (either the share in total income or the share of recipients) is above average while the other is below average. In Ireland which is positioned in the upper left quadrant, for instance, 57 % of the students who are not living with parents receive support from family/partner (international average: 71 %) and this source accounts for 70 % of the recipients' monthly income (international average: 60 %).
- In the group of countries in the upper right quadrant, both the share of recipients as well as the income share of family/partner contributions is above the country average. The share of recipients ranges from 75 % in Montenegro to a full coverage of 100 % in Georgia. The share of family/partner contributions in total income varies between 64 % in Latvia and 90 % in Serbia. It seems that – not solely, but mainly – countries with a comparatively low GDP per capita use a student funding system that relies very much on the financial strength of the students' parents.<sup>9</sup> In the countries in this quadrant, students are – at least de facto, but perhaps also legally regarded to be – financially dependent on their parents.
- In the countries in the lower left quadrant, the share of recipients and the income share of family/partner contributions are both below the country average. The lowest

**In Italy, Croatia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Serbia, and Georgia, more than 80 % of students receive considerable contributions from family/partner**

<sup>9</sup> A comparison of the countries' GDP per capita in Purchasing Power Standards with the average value of the EU-28 countries (EU-28 = 100) for the year 2013 shows that only France has a value above average (108), Italy is very close to the average (98) and all other countries in the quadrant are clearly below average, ranging from values of 29 in Bosnia-Herzegovina to 76 in Slovakia (Eurostat, 2014b).

share of recipients is reported by Denmark (25 %) and the highest by Poland (66 %). The share of family/partner contributions in total income ranges from 21 % in Denmark to 54 % in Malta. Compared to the countries in the upper right quadrant, the countries in the lower left field show rather low shares for both parameters, although the values are not negligible in most countries. It is striking that all Nordic countries and the Netherlands are found in this quadrant. These countries have a GDP per capita which is clearly above the EU-28 average (Eurostat, 2014b). This might indicate that students' families/partners in these countries could bear larger shares of the students' costs, at least when compared to the countries in the upper right quadrant. However, the countries' funding systems seem to function on the basic notion that students are considered to be financially relatively independent of their parents.

### The importance of public support

The analogous analysis as above, taking this time only recipients of public support (which consists of grants and/or loans) into account is presented in the following (Figure 7.8).


**In France, Sweden, and Norway, more than 60 % of students receive public support which makes up more than 30 % of their total income**

The share of recipients of public support is displayed on the x-axis and the relative importance of public support in the recipients' income on the y-axis. Again, the country average allows the distinguishing of four groups of countries.

■ It shows that public support in Germany, Slovenia, Poland, the Nordic countries, and France, reaches a share of the student population that is above the international average of 35 %. In the upper right quadrant the lowest share of recipients, which is marginally higher than 35 % can be found in Germany and the highest in Norway at 75 %. The state is also an important contributor to the recipients' income.

Figure 7.8

Recipients of public support and importance of income source – students not living with parents



Data source: EUROSTUDENT V, G.9. No data: AM, DK, RO, RU, UA. Too few cases: GE.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 3.6 What is the average monthly amount at your disposal from the following sources during the current semester?, 3.7 What are your average expenses for the following items during the current semester?

Notes: Expenses of parents/partner/others in favour of the students were used to calculate transfers in kind.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions: AT.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: DE, GE, IT.

The share of public support in students' total income ranges from 31 % in France to 51 % in Germany (international average: 29 %). For some of these countries, especially the shares of recipients of public support suggest that the subsidiarity principle, which was mentioned before, only partially applies or not at all.

- In Hungary, Estonia, and the Netherlands, the share of recipients of public support is also far above average (ranging between 56 % and 70 %), while the relative importance of public support in the recipients' total income is below average, ranging from 15 % to 28 %. This suggests that public support is expected to be only one of multiple income streams for students in these systems.
- In Switzerland, Slovakia, Latvia, and Austria, the share of public support in the recipients' total income is above average (between 31 % and 44 %) but the recipient quota is below average (between 13 % and 20 %). This could point to the fact that these countries have especially targeted public support schemes.
- Finally, in the lower left quadrant, there are nine countries – the Czech Republic, Serbia, Italy, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Montenegro, Croatia, Lithuania, Ireland, and Malta – providing public support which has a recipient quota below the international average, varying between 9 % in the Czech Republic and slightly below 35 % in Malta. The level of importance of public support for students' total income ranges from 7 % in the Czech Republic to 28 % in Ireland. In most of these countries, students are de facto dependent on their parents in financial terms (see Figure 7.7).

A further distinction that is apparent in Figure 7.8 is the simple one between countries with a share of recipients below 40 % (left side) and those with more than half of all students receiving public support (right side). The data in Figure 7.7 and Figure 7.8 present at least partially two sides of the same coin: In Montenegro, Lithuania, Italy, Croatia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, and Serbia, both the values for the share of recipients and the income share of family/partner contributions are rather high. At the same time, the two respective values for public support are comparatively low in these countries. For Finland, Sweden, Estonia, Norway, Poland, and the Netherlands rather the opposite is true: While the two values for family/partner contributions are rather “low” – at least when compared to the international average –, the values for public support are comparatively high. This suggests that the groups of countries make use of two different systems of student funding: One system in which students are considered as being financially dependent on their parents and where the parents consequently have to shoulder substantial parts of student support. In the other system, students are regarded as being more or even fully independent from their parents in financial terms. There, the public sector absorbs rather high shares of student funding.

### Recipients of public support

Based on the data in Figure 7.8 it has already been pointed out that the shares of recipients of public support differ considerably between countries. This section explores whether there are differences between several student groups with regard to public support (Figure 7.9).


For interpretation of the data it should be noted that public support systems often include multiple streams of funding in different forms (e.g. grants and loans) and with different target groups (underrepresented groups and high-performing students) which exist concurrently, but cannot be differentiated in this analysis. Furthermore, there are



Figure 7.9

**Recipients of public support by various characteristics – students not living with parents**

Share of recipients of public support on cross-country average (in %)



**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, G.9, G.10. **No data:** RO; non-university: IT, ME, SE, SK; delayed transition: NO, PL; females, males, without HE background, with HE background, delayed transition, younger than 22 years, at least 22 but younger than 25 years, at least 25 but younger than 30 years, at least 30 years: AM. **Too few cases:** GE; all students groups except for all students, Bachelor, university, females, without HE background, younger than 22 years: MT; low-intensity: SK; delayed transition: SK; students at least 25 but younger than 30 years: SK; students at least 30 years: SK.

**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 3.6 What is the average monthly amount at your disposal from the following sources during the current semester?

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** AT.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

overlaps between certain groups, e.g. a student receiving public support may strive for a Bachelor's degree at a university, studying with high intensity. Therefore, the focus of comparison should be on contrastive pairs (e.g. low-intensity vs. high-intensity).

**On cross-country average, students at higher ages benefit from public support clearly less than average**

Across countries, on average 34 % of all students benefit from public support. There are some groups of students who benefit especially from this income source, while others benefit clearly less than average. On the one hand, the recipient quota for public support is clearly above average, with shares ranging between 39 % and 44 %, among e.g. high-intensity students and young students (all those who are younger than 25 years). On the other hand, for low-intensity students, delayed transition students, and older students (at least 30 years old), the share of recipients is markedly below average, with values between 23 % and 28 %. Some arguments that are related to student age could shed some light on these differences: In many countries, student age is a personal characteristic which is subject to the eligibility criteria for public support. Students who exceed a certain age limit are not eligible for public support. Furthermore, the granting of public support is often means-tested, i.e. the eligibility is dependent on the income of students and perhaps also on that of their parents/partner. It has already been pointed out that with rising age, students tend to receive higher shares of their total income from gainful employment. This may be caused, e.g., by the necessity to care for their dependents. By doing so, older students might exceed the upper limit for additional earnings as defined by the eligibility criteria. As a result, there may be cutbacks in public support, perhaps to the extent that students lose it completely.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>10</sup> This problem could arise in particular if the amount of working hours is not divisible at the student's discretion (e.g. in order not to exceed the threshold for additional earnings, a student may like to be employed for eight hours per week but due to requirements of the company the employer accepts only 16 hours per week).

High-intensity students – who have a recipient quota above average – are mainly found in the younger age groups (younger than 25 years). On cross-country average, high-intensity students are 23 years old and they are clearly younger than their peers who study with low-intensity who have a mean age of 26 years (>DRM). Delayed transition students – who have a recipient quota of only 28% – have out of all EUROSTUDENT focus groups (that are not based on age) the highest average age across countries (29 years, >DRM).


To some extent, the age-related arguments may explain the variation in the shares of recipients, though not in all cases. By comparing women and men, for instance, it becomes apparent that the share of recipients is slightly higher among female students (36% vs. 34%). This cannot be explained by age as both groups show only very small age differences within countries and their mean age across countries is the same (24 years). It may be, however, that females more often have better school grades than males (Voyer & Voyer, 2014), thus increasing their likelihood for eligibility if the support is based also on merit. Furthermore, female students' performance during studies may be more successful compared to males. Finally, the reason why students without HE background have a higher recipient quota (37%) than their counterparts with HE background (33%) could be that the countries' public support systems aim at reducing income disparities between students which can be caused by different educational backgrounds. If this is true, the differing recipient quotas would be coherent with the policies pursued, but based on such highly aggregated data it cannot be judged whether the difference is appropriate.

Figure 7.10

#### Importance of public support by educational background – students not living with parents

Public support as share of students' total monthly income including transfers in kind for students with(out) HE background (in %)

Students with HE background: Public support as share of total income (in %)



**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, G.10. **No data:** AM, DK, RO, RU, UA. **Too few cases:** Students with HE background: MT; students with and without HE background: GE.

**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 3.6 What is the average monthly amount at your disposal from the following sources during the current semester?, 3.7 What are your average expenses for the following items during the current semester?

**Notes:** Expenses of parents/partner/others in favour of the students were used to calculate transfers in kind.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** AT.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.



The way the public sector supports students from different education backgrounds is examined again in more detail (Figure 7.10). Data points that are positioned below the diagonal imply that in the respective country public support results in a higher income share for students without HE background than for their peers with HE background. For data points above the diagonal the opposite is true. If a country's position coincides with the diagonal, public support makes up the same share of total income for both student groups.

**In most EURO-STUDENT countries, students without HE background benefit more from public support in relative terms than their peers with HE background**

■ In 18 out of 22 countries for which data are available, students without HE background benefit more from public support in relative terms than their counterparts with HE background. In addition, in 16 out of the 18 countries the former group receives also higher average monthly amounts of public support (>DRM). The differences in both absolute amounts and shares of total income between the two groups are often not very pronounced. The highest differences in the shares between the two groups can be found in France (students without HE background: + 13 percentage points), Slovakia (+ 11 percentage points), and Germany (+ 10 percentage points).

There are at least two reasons why the difference between the two groups may not be as pronounced as one might expect for some of the countries. On the one hand and related to share of recipients, this is because the category “without HE background” is quite broad and many targeted public support schemes will focus on a much smaller group of recipients (e.g. those from low education backgrounds >Chapter 4); those outside of the narrower category but still categorised as “without HE background” will not receive public support. On the other hand and related to share of public support in total income, older students – who frequently are found in the category “without HE background” – tend to have a higher overall income level, reducing the relative impact of public support on their total income level.

■ In six countries (the Czech Republic, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Lithuania, Norway, Latvia, and Sweden), students with HE background receive higher absolute amounts of public support on average per month than their peers without HE background. In four of these countries (the Czech Republic, Lithuania, Norway, and Sweden), this results also in higher shares of public support in total income for student with HE background. The differences in the shares between the two groups in most of these countries are only small (ranging from 1 percentage point in the Czech Republic to 3 percentage points in Sweden). In Norway the difference is pronounced (9 percentage points).

There are some reasons that could generally explain why students with HE background receive similar levels of or even more public support in absolute and relative terms in some of the countries. If public support is e.g. designed as a merit-based system, it would not be unusual that students with HE background profit more as they may have more favourable familial framework conditions supporting their performance (see for example Jacob & Klein, 2013; OECD, 2010; Schneider & Franke, 2014). Furthermore, countries with rather market-oriented student support instruments offer public loans which are subject to interest. Students from low education backgrounds might be more risk-averse than their peers with HE background and, therefore, back away from taking out public loans.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>11</sup> Previous research in this area has shown that in Norway, which makes use of a public loan system that is subject to interest, among students who are not living with parents the amount of public loans taken out increases for students the higher their socio-economic status (Schwarzenberger, 2008).

## Discussion and policy considerations

The financial heterogeneity of students across the countries is quite pronounced. In prosperous countries such as Norway, Sweden, and Switzerland, the total income of students who are not living with parents is on average remarkably higher than for students in low-GDP countries such as Armenia, Georgia, and Serbia. In the first group of countries, the price level is noticeably higher which also affects the subsistence level of students. For that reason alone, students in those countries would need higher amounts of money. In addition, high-GDP countries have more resources at their disposal that can be invested in education, perhaps even beyond the students' subsistence level. So in the end, it would not be surprising if students in the first group of countries are comparatively better off than their peers in low-GDP countries. Catching up with the high-GDP countries in a process of economic growth will take some time so that the provision of a "level playing field" for students across countries cannot be expected too soon (if at all).

Students' financial heterogeneity does not only exist between countries, but also within countries. In Estonia, Poland, and Russia, for example, the gap between low and high incomes of students who are not living with parents is quite large. Student income is rather evenly distributed in Austria, Denmark, Germany, and the Netherlands. The financial dissimilarity of a national student body may be caused, *inter alia*, by different access of students to income sources which may create different burdens for the students' time budget (e.g. family support vs. own earnings). Of particular relevance are those students in the lowest income category – in many countries, the bottom fifth of students according to their monthly income has an income level at least one third lower than the median income. Those students may be at risk of having unfavourable financial conditions that may affect duration and success of their studies. Paying special attention to such vulnerable student groups is a defined goal of the social dimension of the EHEA. In this context, it would be of interest for further research whether a higher degree of income concentration in a country is associated with a higher risk of an extremely low standard of living for some parts of the student population.

Student funding in the EUROSTUDENT countries seems to broadly follow the subsidiarity principle: only when the private sector has exhausted all means to finance students in HE does the public sector step into the breach. On aggregate across countries, students themselves and their families/partners provide about four fifths of students' total income, while the state accounts for about one tenth of students' means; this holds for students living with parents and those living away from them. The picture becomes more complex, however, when looking at more disaggregated data. In a number of countries such as Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, Italy, Lithuania, Montenegro, and Serbia, large parts of the students who are not living with parents receive support from family/partner and this source provides also a high share in students' total income. At the same time, public support plays only a minor role. In Estonia, Finland, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, and Poland, rather the opposite is true. In these countries, public support reaches a comparatively large share of the student population and it provides also a high proportion of students' income; support from family/partner is, by contrast, relatively less marked, at least compared to the international average. Apparently, there are different underlying core concepts in the countries which

consider students either as financially dependent on or independent of their parents. In those countries which follow the former concept, the combined ability to pay of students and their families/partners is a crucial determinant for participation in HE.

Across the EUROSTUDENT countries, there is some indication that public support is used to counteract social disparities between students in HE, which would be well in line with EHEA countries' policy on disadvantaged student groups. On cross-country average, 37 % of students without HE background not living with parents receive direct state support, whereas the recipient quota among students with HE background living away from parents amounts to 33 %. Furthermore, in most countries, students without HE background receive more public support in absolute and relative terms than students with HE background. Whether the differences in the shares of recipients and the average monthly amounts granted are deemed appropriate in the countries needs to be explored in an in-depth analysis for each national system with a higher degree of distinction between different social groups of students.

Some implications of the use of different funding sources come to light when exploring the situation of students who depend on one specific income source. Of students who are not living with parents, the highest total monthly income is, on cross-country average, available to those who depend on own earnings. Students with a dependency on family support receive the second highest income, and the lowest average income is available to students who depend on public support. Further analysis has shown that there are apparently some differences in the living situation of students who belong to these groups. Students who depend on own earnings, for instance, are on cross-country average five years older than their peers who depend on public support. In contrast to younger students, older students tend more towards living with partner and having children, which may cause higher costs. This may mean, however, that older students have more difficulties (or at worst: no chance at all) to finance their studies mainly by public support. In the face of aging populations and the call for lifelong learning societies – with second chance routes to further qualifications – it may be doubtful whether the current priorities of the funding schemes in the EHEA countries are already in line with such challenges and goals.

# Tables

Table A7.1

## Total monthly income including transfers in kind – students living with parents

Income in Euro (arithm. mean)

Country	Family/partner	Public sources	Self-earned income	Other	Total
AM	147	11	39	18	214
AT	354	48	265	56	723
BA	345	14	17	15	391
CH	792	45	584	85	1,505
CZ	88	0	171	26	285
DE	379	71	217	35	702
DK	38	415	404	10	866
EE	89	77	237	22	425
FI	499	106	289	6	900
FR	228	117	149	11	505
GE	287	0	48	8	343
HR	269	16	94	26	404
HU	181	46	88	18	333
IE	431	58	198	67	754
IT	–	–	–	–	–
LT	334	25	171	12	542
LV	376	22	163	19	581
ME	402	16	117	19	555
MT	252	91	251	18	612
NL	203	127	241	162	733
NO	312	472	607	76	1,467
PL	53	44	234	11	341
RO	–	–	–	–	–
RS	275	3	18	16	312
RU	–	–	–	–	–
SE	350	370	347	505	1,572
SI	256	57	203	27	542
SK	300	11	211	13	534
UA	–	–	–	–	–

– no data

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, G.1. **No data:** IT, RO, RU, UA.

**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 3.6 What is the average monthly amount at your disposal from the following sources during the current semester?, 3.7 What are your average expenses for the following items during the current semester?

**Notes:** Expenses of parents/partner/others in favour of the students were used to calculate transfers in kind.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** AT, DK, GE.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

Table A7.2

**Total monthly income including transfers in kind of Bachelor and Master students by basic type of housing**

Income in Euro (arithm. mean)

Country	Bachelor students		Master students	
	Living with parents	Not living with parents	Living with parents	Not living with parents
AM	212	269	283	238
AT	693	1,027	838	1,131
BA	378	474	385	539
CH	1,474	2,143	1,624	2,174
CZ	256	499	326	491
DE	689	878	789	978
DK	851	1,154	1,075	1,198
EE	386	545	611	763
FI	912	1,264	860	1,900
FR	494	936	636	1,092
GE	334	376	395	499
HR	402	497	463	563
HU	323	476	364	527
IE	733	975	990	1,290
IT	–	658	–	721
LT	533	569	611	626
LV	576	504	624	763
ME	545	535	630	679
MT	541	728	846	1,491
NL	721	1,214	886	1,290
NO	1,471	2,080	1,528	2,434
PL	338	409	353	504
RO	–	–	–	–
RS	314	330	324	351
RU	–	–	–	–
SE	1,735	2,059	1,401	1,916
SI	542	639	592	752
SK	478	422	539	469
UA	–	–	–	–

– no data

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, G.1. **No data:** RO, RU, UA; Bachelor and Master students living with parents: IT.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 3.6 What is the average monthly amount at your disposal from the following sources during the current semester?, 3.7 What are your average expenses for the following items during the current semester?**Notes:** Expenses of parents/partner/others in favour of the students were used to calculate transfers in kind.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** AT, DK, GE.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

Table A7.3

**Total monthly income including transfers in kind of students without HE background – students not living with parents**

Income in Euro (arithm. mean)

Country	Family/partner	Public sources	Self-earned income	Other	Total
AM	134	6	32	20	192
AT	334	109	518	134	1,095
BA	385	17	33	15	449
CH	746	152	1,279	153	2,330
CZ	147	5	310	38	501
DE	343	213	279	63	898
DK	112	733	283	24	1,152
EE	98	93	397	25	613
FI	338	200	879	128	1,545
FR	396	246	237	35	914
GE	285	0	43	13	341
HR	307	30	138	29	505
HU	224	50	180	32	486
IE	385	83	331	182	981
IT	398	33	225	2	658
LT	309	39	208	21	576
LV	295	28	196	22	541
ME	303	15	107	22	446
MT	496	39	723	37	1,295
NL	283	203	532	265	1,283
NO	615	549	1,424	244	2,832
PL	92	66	266	13	437
RO	–	–	–	–	–
RS	287	6	18	18	329
RU	–	–	–	–	–
SE	404	467	965	326	2,161
SI	253	85	301	32	673
SK	229	26	170	15	439
UA	–	–	–	–	–

– no data

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, G.2. **No data:** RO, RU, UA.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 3.6 What is the average monthly amount at your disposal from the following sources during the current semester?, 3.7 What are your average expenses for the following items during the current semester?**Notes:** Expenses of parents/partner/others in favour of the students were used to calculate transfers in kind.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** AT, GE.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

Table A7.4

**Total monthly income including transfers in kind of students with HE background – students not living with parents**

Income in Euro (arithm. mean)

Country	Family/partner	Public sources	Self-earned income	Other	Total
AM	220	18	23	8	269
AT	502	32	361	108	1,003
BA	476	13	33	20	542
CH	1,016	73	909	119	2,117
CZ	193	7	260	31	491
DE	520	103	232	54	909
DK	112	715	321	24	1,173
EE	133	83	357	32	605
FI	275	216	649	120	1,260
FR	610	158	199	30	997
GE	319	0	80	15	414
HR	354	24	103	52	533
HU	275	43	142	26	486
IE	627	55	323	136	1,141
IT	525	16	114	3	658
LT	331	28	217	14	590
LV	303	31	237	33	604
ME	368	20	123	35	546
MT	204	31	648	104	987
NL	448	233	308	235	1,223
NO	481	697	960	131	2,269
PL	153	43	249	26	471
RO	–	–	–	–	–
RS	302	5	22	16	345
RU	–	–	–	–	–
SE	373	583	655	357	1,968
SI	353	68	185	38	644
SK	250	13	136	10	410
UA	–	–	–	–	–

– no data

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, G.2. **No data:** RO, RU, UA.

**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 3.6 What is the average monthly amount at your disposal from the following sources during the current semester?, 3.7 What are your average expenses for the following items during the current semester?

**Notes:** Expenses of parents/partner/others in favour of the students were used to calculate transfers in kind.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** AT, GE.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

## Chapter 8

# Students' expenses

### Key findings

- **The composition of students' expenditure:** Across countries, students not living with parents dedicate on average 55 % of their total monthly expenses to living costs. An additional 32 % are financed by parents/partner/others. Study-related costs which are paid by students make up 6 % of all expenses. The share of study-related costs paid by parents/partner/others is slightly higher (7 %).
- **Key expenditure of Bachelor students:** Bachelor students who are not living with parents allocate, on average across countries, about one third of total expenses to accommodation, 9 % to fees, and 7 % to transportation.
- **Students' expenditure for accommodation:** Students who live with their partner/children have the highest monthly expenses for accommodation on average across countries. In contrast, students living in student accommodation have the lowest average housing costs per month.
- **Accommodation costs by students' dependency on a specific income source:** On aggregate across countries, students who are depending on family support spend the highest average amount per month on accommodation and utilities. Their peers who are depending on own earnings pay slightly less for this purpose and students depending on public support have clearly the lowest spending on housing.
- **Fee-paying Bachelor students:** In seven out of 21 countries with available data, the majority of Bachelor students pay fees. This holds for Switzerland, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Italy, Croatia, Slovakia, Armenia, and Ireland. In the other countries, the group of fee-payers is a minority among Bachelor students.
- **Fees by type of higher education institution:** In 9 out of 18 countries, students attending non-universities have on average higher monthly expenses for fees than their fellow students at universities. In Austria, Slovenia, Croatia, Poland, and Hungary, the average expenses for fees of students at non-universities are at least twice as high than for their peers at universities.
- **Students' assessment of their financial situation:** In almost all EUROSTUDENT countries, the majority of students report to have currently at most moderate financial difficulties. In Slovenia, Norway, Georgia, Ireland, Denmark, Croatia, Lithuania, Romania, Poland, and Montenegro, however, more than a third of students report to have either serious or very serious financial difficulties. Of students who depend on a specific income source, on average across countries, 29 % of those dependent on family support report to have (very) serious financial difficulties. The respective share among students dependent on own earnings is 33 % and it is highest among those who depend on public support at 38 %.



## Main issues

This chapter analyses the structure and magnitude of students' expenditure as well as some of its main influential factors. Some of students' expenses are directly related to participation in higher education (HE), such as fees for attending a higher education institution (HEI). Other expenses may occur partially or even completely independently of taking part in HE. Examples for this are expenses for food or clothing. For the analyses in this chapter, all expenses are taken into account in order to get a comprehensive picture of students' living conditions, although – in particular cases – the focus will be on specific expenditure categories.

### The composition of students' expenditure

As indicated above, students may spend their money on a number of different expenditure items. To simplify analyses, the respective costs were assigned to the categories “living costs” and “study-related costs” (see below for further explanation). Additionally, expenditures are differentiated by payer. In many cases, students do not need to meet their expenses by themselves; instead they receive support from their parents, other relatives, or the partner. The analysis will investigate in which way students and their families/partners share the students' costs and whether there are differences between countries. Within the categories “living costs” and “study-related costs”, there are some expenditure items that may have a special importance for students. Expenditures on accommodation, transportation, and fees are regarded to be such “key expenditures”. On the one hand, these types of costs may be especially important for students due to their shares in total expenses. On the other hand, these expenditure items are the ones most readily targeted through policy measures, i.e. through providing cheaper accommodation for students, subsidies for transportation, and partial or full exemption from tuition fees. The analysis will therefore focus on these items as well.

### Students' expenditure for accommodation

The costs for students' accommodation typically absorb a large chunk of students' budget, especially when living away from their parents. Students make use of different types of accommodation that can be aggregated to a limited number of housing forms (>Chapter 9). The analysis will take a look at the average costs incurred by the various forms of housing. Further, it will be investigated whether the magnitude of accommodation costs is related to the dominant source of students' income. Do students depending on different income sources spend different amounts on their housing? The assumption is that any differences result from budgets of different sizes available to students depending on a certain income source, resulting in budget restrictions that are more or less tight.

### Students' expenditure for fees

Students often contribute to the financing of HEIs by paying fees. However, the obligation to pay fees does not apply to all students in the same way. The following will investigate to what extent Bachelor students in the EUROSTUDENT countries are obliged to pay fees. In many countries, there are different types of institutions providing HE for students. These institutions can be divided, e.g., into universities and non-universities (such as universities of applied sciences or polytechnics). A traditional demarcation between the two types of HEIs is that universities have a stronger orientation towards

research, offer education that is more theoretically oriented and – especially since the massification of HE – instruct larger classes. Although this traditional demarcation has been increasingly losing its significance over the last two decades (see Leitner, 2009, for the German HE system), the different types of HEIs still may have different cost structures and pursue different policies on charging fees. The analysis compares relative differences in the level of average monthly fees between universities and non-universities within and across the EUROSTUDENT countries.

### Students' assessment of their financial situation

As an indication of the sufficiency and adequacy of students' income to cover their expenses, students' satisfaction with their financial situation is analysed. As part of the EUROSTUDENT survey, students were asked to what extent they currently experience financial difficulties. The respective answer scale contained five response options, ranging from "very seriously" to "not at all". The focus will be on students who report to experience serious or very serious financial difficulties. Additionally, it will be investigated whether differences can be found between students depending on different income sources.

## Methodological and conceptual notes

The EUROSTUDENT Conventions distinguish between two basic types of student expenditure<sup>1</sup> which are explained in the following.

### Living costs

The category living costs contains nine sub-categories: a) Accommodation costs (rent or mortgage as well as utilities), b) food, c) transportation, d) communication (telephone, internet, etc.), e) health (e.g. medical insurance), f) childcare, g) debt payment (except mortgage), h) social and leisure activities, i) other regular living costs (which include clothing, toiletries, tobacco, pets, insurance [except medical insurance]). The focus of this category is on the students' regular monthly costs. For this reason, students' extraordinary expenses (e.g., washing machines, holiday travel) were excluded.<sup>2</sup>

### Study-related costs

Study-related costs are divided into four sub-categories: a) Fees (covering tuition fees, registration fees, examination fees, and administrative fees), b) social welfare contributions to the HEI and student associations, c) learning materials (e.g. books, photocopying, field trips, etc.), and d) other regular study-related costs (e.g. for private tutoring or additional courses). In the questionnaire, study-related costs were asked per semester, however, for data delivery the values were re-calculated as monthly expenses to assure comparability with the category living costs.

<sup>1</sup> In this chapter the terms "expenses"/"expenditure" and "costs" are used synonymously although they have a somewhat different meaning, e.g., in business administration.

<sup>2</sup> The EUROSTUDENT network is certainly aware of the fact that students are also confronted with unavoidable extraordinary expenses during the course of their studies. Taking those into account, however, would overstate the ordinary running costs that typically occur per month.

## Costs by payer

Another crucial differentiation emphasises the importance of the payer. In all countries, the burden of financing individual participation in HE is not only borne by the students themselves, but also by their parents, their partner, or other persons. The contributions of others may take on different forms: in some cases, students are provided with money directly (= transfers in cash); in other cases students' debts are paid to the creditor directly, i.e. those payments are intangible for the students (= transfers in kind). Also combinations of the two types of transfers may occur. In empirical research it is a big challenge to capture especially the second kind of support. For students it is far from easy to report this as they cannot observe cash flows and, therefore, may not be in the position to assess precise amounts. However, EUROSTUDENT makes the attempt to quantify transfers in kind as well as it is of utmost importance to get the entire picture of the economic situation of students. Thus, expenditures are differentiated by payments by students (out-of-own-pocket) and payments by parents/partner/others.<sup>3</sup> In the EUROSTUDENT core questionnaire, payments by the second group were captured for both living costs and study-related costs. In the following figures, these transfers in kind are either explicitly displayed or included in the students' expenses.

## Currency amounts

This chapter contains several figures in which the magnitude of student expenses is displayed. Although most of the EUROSTUDENT countries are not (yet) part of the Euro area,<sup>4</sup> the Euro has been used as a common currency to ensure data comparability. To this end, the values which have been reported by the non-Euro countries in national currency needed to be converted into Euro values. The respective currency conversion factors that have been applied are based on exchange rates as reported by the European Central Bank (ECB), Eurostat, and the internet portal OANDA (European Central Bank, 2014a; Eurostat, 2014c; OANDA, 2014). For conversion, half-yearly average exchange rate values were used for the period in which the respective EUROSTUDENT countries have executed their field phase. When assessing the magnitude of student expenses in Euro values, it should be kept in mind that the level of expenditure for the non-Euro countries can be considerably influenced by the exchange rate utilized.

## Strengths and shortcomings of EUROSTUDENT data

Official statistics commonly provide only a rather rough picture of private expenses on higher education, especially on an international level. The OECD, for instance, in "Education at a Glance", reports expenditure of private households to institutions of tertiary education, but does not differentiate any further within this category. Furthermore, living costs of students – which can be influenced by participation in HE – are not captured at all (OECD, 2014). In contrast, student surveys at the national level are able to provide such data in detail, but – according to the nature of things – only for the student body in the respective countries, i.e. they lack the international perspective. In this sense, EUROSTUDENT can fill a gap that is not covered by these other data sources. As mentioned before (>Chapter 7), students' self-reported data may sometimes

<sup>3</sup> It should be noted that the concept of payer does not completely reveal the sources of funds in every case. This is especially true if students receive at the same time both transfers in cash and in kind from their parents. The students' payments would then be financed – at least to some extent – by their parents as well. In this case, the share of parental transfers in kind would not reflect the full extent of parental support.

<sup>4</sup> This holds for Armenia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Switzerland, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Georgia, Croatia, Hungary, Lithuania, and Latvia (both at the time of the survey), Norway, Poland, Romania, Serbia, Russia, Sweden, and Ukraine.

lack accuracy as students may not be able or not willing to answer all survey questions. Nevertheless, for some kind of data they are still the best source available.

### Notes on national surveys

For a few countries, deviations from the EUROSTUDENT survey conventions should be noted.

- France: The student survey in France did not contain questions on study-related expenses.
- Germany:
  - In Germany, data are not available for all expenditure categories as defined by EUROSTUDENT. In order to calculate percentages without overestimating the shares in total expenses, the absolute values for the specific expenditure categories were related to total student income, which was used as a proxy for total student expenses. Therefore, the shares do not sum up to 100 %.
  - For the students' assessment of their financial situation the question and response categories which have been used deviate from the EUROSTUDENT core questionnaire. In Germany, students were asked to respond to the following statement: "The funding of my subsistence during studies is ensured." The five-staged response scale ranged from "does not apply at all" to "applies completely".
- Italy: Payments by parents/partner/others were not surveyed.
- Norway:
  - For students' assessment of their financial situation, the question and response categories which were used deviate from the EUROSTUDENT core questionnaire. In Norway, the students were asked: "To what extent do you feel that your money is insufficient?" The five-staged response scale ranged from "very largely" to "very little".
  - Data on fees are excluded as the Norwegian questionnaire did not differentiate all items in the same way as the EUROSTUDENT core questionnaire.

## Data and interpretation

### The composition of students' expenditure

Students and their relatives/partners are bearing living costs and study-related costs during the students' period in HE. A breakdown of these types of expenses differentiated by payer for students not living with parents is shown in Figure 8.1.

In almost all countries, living costs make up the largest proportion of combined expenses from students and their families/partners. Across countries, students dedicate on average 55 % of their total monthly expenses to living costs. An additional 32 % are financed by parents/partner/others. Study-related costs which are paid by students make up 6 % of all expenses. The share of study-related costs paid by families/partners/others is slightly higher (7 %).


- In Finland, Austria, Norway, Sweden, and Malta, the share of living costs paid by students is particularly high and amounts to at least 75 % of students' total expenditure. At the same time, the shares of living costs that are directly borne by parents/partners/others are rather low in these countries.

*Students not living with parents dedicate, on average across countries, more than four fifths of total expenses (including transfers in kind) to living costs*

Figure 8.1

**Composition of students' expenditure by payer and type of housing**

Living costs and study-related costs as share of total monthly expenditure – students not living with parents

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, F.1. **No data:** DE, IT, UA; study-related costs: FR.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 3.7 What are your average expenses for the following items during the current semester?**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** FR.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

- The students' relatives/partners directly cover large shares of the students' living costs in Russia, Georgia, Serbia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, and Armenia: In these countries, the living costs paid by others make up at least 54 % of students' total expenses. Accordingly, in these countries the shares of living costs paid by the students themselves are rather low, ranging between 31 % in Russia and 10 % in Armenia.
- Study-related costs paid by students are comparatively high in Denmark, Croatia, the Netherlands, Slovenia, and the Czech Republic, with shares of at least 10 % of total expenditure.
- Transfers in kind from parents/partners for study-related costs are relatively high in Armenia, with above 30 % of total expenses. There, fees make up the lion's share in study-related expenses.

It is striking that in countries with a rather low GDP per capita the total share of familial transfers in kind (for both living costs and study-related costs) in students' total monthly expenses is relatively high. In Romania, Russia, Georgia, Serbia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, and Armenia, this share ranges between 56 % (Romania) and 85 % (Armenia). This emphasizes the important role of the family for the student financing system; this is also reflected in the data on the students' income structure which show that in these countries provisions from family/partner is the dominating source of students' income (>Chapter 7).


When looking at students living with parents, some differences can be observed compared to students not living with parents (Table A8.1). On cross-country average, students living with parents spend markedly less on living costs (37 %), at the same time their relatives/partners bear a higher share of these costs (46 %). Study-related costs

Figure 8.2

## Profile of Bachelor students' key expenditure – students not living with parents

Expenditure paid by students and parents/partner/others

Share of total monthly expenses in %



Data source: EUROSTUDENT V, F.2. No data: RU, UA; fees: DE, FR, NO.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 3.7 What are your average expenses for the following items during the current semester?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions: DE, FR, IT, NO.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: DE, GE, IT.

which are paid by students amount to 8% and the share of parents/partner/others makes up 10% of total expenses.

Bachelor students' expenses for the key expenditures accommodation, transportation, and fees (students not living with parents) are analysed in the following (Figure 8.2).

In all countries, Bachelor students not living with parents dedicate the highest share of key expenses to accommodation (the only exception being Armenia, where the share spent on fees is marginally higher). The students – financially supported by parents/partner/others – spend on average about one third of their expenses on housing.

- The highest burden is borne by students in France, Finland, and Sweden, where the costs of housing absorb at least 40% of students' total expenses. At the other end of the spectrum lie the Czech Republic, Armenia, Malta, and Romania, where students not living with parents spend 23% or less of their budget on lodging.

**BA students not living with parents spend, on average across countries, about one third of total expenses on accommodation**

The second most important cost category is fees, which require on average across countries 9% of the students' total expenditure. Some differences between the countries can be noted:

- In Ireland, the Netherlands, Latvia, and Armenia, between 15% and 24% of students' expenditure are determined by fees. By contrast, in Sweden, Poland, Denmark, the Czech Republic, Austria, Slovenia, Estonia, Slovakia, and Malta, this share does not exceed 5%. In Finland, there are no fees for Bachelor and Master programmes.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Students in Finland, however, are paying so called student union fees which were assigned to the category "social welfare contributions" according to the EUROSTUDENT Conventions. Their share in total expenses is quite small (less than 1% for all students not living with parents) (>DRM).



The least important category of key expenditure is transportation, for which the mean value across countries amounts to 7 %. The differences between the countries are rather moderate.

- In country comparison, it is students in Hungary and Slovakia who dedicate the highest shares of key expenses to transportation (10 %). Their fellow students in the Netherlands, Denmark, and Armenia spend only between 3 % and 4 % on transportation.

Although transportation is on aggregate the least important expenditure category out of the three considered, there are ten countries where the share which is spent on transportation is higher than that for fees.

- This holds for the Scandinavian countries, Poland, Austria, Slovenia, Estonia, Slovakia, the Czech Republic, and Malta. This refers to countries where tuition fees are relatively low or do not exist.

Transportation costs are associated with students' form of accommodation. While living with parents can be cost-saving for students in some respects (in terms of e.g. lower payments for rent, food, etc.), this form of housing may cause higher transportation costs due to longer distances for commuting from home to the HEI.<sup>6</sup> By contrast, students who are living, e.g., in a student accommodation can profit from shorter travels to the HEI and, subsequently, perhaps lower transportation costs, but face higher expenses for accommodation.

When comparing the spending profile of Master students and Bachelor students, it turns out that Master students spend on aggregate slightly less on accommodation (31 % vs. 32 %), the same share on transportation (7 %), and marginally more on fees (10 % vs. 9 %, Table A8.2). If the same analysis is conducted for students who differ by educational background (students without HE background vs. students with HE background), there are hardly any differences in key expenditure on cross-country average (Table A8.3).

### Students' expenditure for accommodation

Accommodation is, in all countries, an important expenditure item for students who have moved away from their parents' home and in more than four fifths of the countries observed it proves to be the most expensive item. However, depending on the type of housing, expenses for accommodation burden the budget of students and their parents/partner in different ways (Figure 8.3).


**Students living with partner/children have the highest monthly expenses for accommodation**

Students who are living alone supported by family/partner pay across the countries an average monthly amount for accommodation including utilities of 294 Euro (chart a). For students who are living with their partner/children the respective amount is 320 Euro (chart b). The average housing costs for living in a student accommodation amount to 212 Euro per month (chart c).

<sup>6</sup> Students living with parents have indeed in almost all countries the longest commuting time in comparison to all forms of accommodation and particularly to student accommodation (i.e. student halls of residence) (> Chapter 9). Across countries, all students living with parents allocate 10 % of their total expenses to transportation, whereas this share amounts to 7 % for their fellow students who are not living with parents (> DRM).

Figure 8.3

## Accommodation costs paid by students and parents/partner/others by type of housing



Data source: EUROSTUDENT V, E.6. No data: RU, UA; chart c): GE. Too few cases: chart a) and c): MT.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 3.7 What are your average expenses for the following items during the current semester?

Notes: In Georgia student accommodation does not exist.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions: IT.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: DE, GE, IT.



Based on these cross-country averages, students who share their accommodation with partner/children have the highest level of expenses. This could be explained by the simple fact that they need more space compared to their peers who are living alone which results in higher rents. Student accommodation turns out to be clearly the cheapest form of housing among all options outside the parental home (including the option “with other person/s” which is not displayed in the figure above) (>DRM). In many countries, student accommodation is subsidised by public funds in order to provide students with affordable housing space, perhaps in close vicinity to the HEI attended. This policy reduces the accommodation prices below market level. The general picture sketched using averages across all countries fits broadly for the within-country comparison for most of the countries as well.

Some further patterns for accommodation costs can be found across countries and across the forms of housing.

- The countries with the highest levels of accommodation costs in all three charts are Switzerland, Norway, and Sweden.
- Apart from the three countries mentioned before, there is a further group of eight countries that show values for all three types of housing which are above the international average as well. These countries are Denmark, the Netherlands, Finland, Ireland, France, Poland, Germany, and Austria.
- In the group of countries encompassing, e.g., Latvia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Slovakia, Lithuania, Georgia, and Serbia, the accommodation costs for students in the different forms of housing are generally on a rather low level, at least from an international perspective.

In the first two groups of countries, both the GDP per capita as well as the price level is above the EU-28 average. The only exception is Poland, where both values are below the average. In the third group of countries both values are clearly below the average for the EU-28 (Eurostat, 2014a; Eurostat, 2014b). The meaning of the GDP per capita and the overall price level has already been discussed with respect to student income (>Chapter 7). As accommodation costs including utilities are an essential component of a country's price level,<sup>7</sup> it would not be surprising if both factors had some explanatory power for the grouping of the countries.

Further analysis also suggests that the different housing options are being taken up by different groups of students. The older students are, the more they tend to live with partner/children. Across countries and different age groups, the share of students in this form of housing steadily increases from 8% in the age group “younger than 22 years” to 59% in the group “at least 30 years” (>Chapter 9). Older students also have higher levels of total income than younger ones (>Chapter 7) which may indicate that they are able to afford more expensive housing space. For students living in student accommodation the opposite is true: the older the students are, the lower is the share utilizing this type of housing; their share is decreasing from 22% among those younger than 22 years to 4% who are 30 years or older (>Chapter 9).


<sup>7</sup> For the calculation of the European Central Bank's „Harmonised Index of Consumer Prices”, for instance, which is used to reflect a country's price level and its development, housing costs including utilities make up more than 15% of the whole consumer basket (European Central Bank, 2014b).

Figure 8.4

**Accommodation costs by students' finance-related characteristics – students not living with parents**

Expenditure paid by students and parents/partner/others by dependency on an income source

Monthly amounts in Euro (arithm. mean)



**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, F.4. **No data:** UA; students dependent on public support: GE, PL. **Too few cases:** Students dependent on own earnings: AM; students dependent on public support: AM, CZ, MT, RU.

**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 3.7 What are your average expenses for the following items during the current semester?

**Notes:** Values above the country abbreviations present the amounts for students dependent on family support.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** IT.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

Accommodation expenditure of students who are not living with parents and who are depending on a specific income source is shown in Figure 8.4. According to the EUROSTUDENT Conventions, students depend on an income source if the respective source provides more than 50 % of students' total income (including transfers in kind).

On aggregate, students who are depending on family support dedicate 292 Euro per month to accommodation and utilities. Their peers who are depending on own earnings pay slightly less (287 Euro per month) for this purpose. Students who are depending on public support spend 215 Euro on housing.

- In all Scandinavian countries and Switzerland, the values for the three student groups are rather high. The amounts paid by students dependent on family support, for instance, are clearly above 500 Euro, with a maximum in Denmark with more than 1,200 Euro.
- In Latvia, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Georgia, and Armenia, the level of accommodation costs is relatively low. Students depending on family support spend less than 100 Euro per month on housing.

According to the findings, students depending on family support pay the highest accommodation costs, whereas students who are depending on the state pay the lowest amounts. This picture needs to be complemented by a look at a more disaggregated level.

- In comparison of the three student groups, there are 16 countries in which students who depend on income from gainful employment have the highest spending on accommodation.

**Students depending on public support have the lowest spending on accommodation**

- In another 10 countries (including all Scandinavian countries, Italy, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Russia, Romania, Serbia, and Georgia) it is students with a dependency on family support who pay the highest amounts on housing.
- In all countries for which data are available, students with a dependency on public support have the lowest expenditure on accommodation.

The data suggest that students who live away from their parents and who are depending on direct state support (have to) choose a type of accommodation which is especially cheap. It shows that – across countries – 31 % of these students live in student accommodation. Compared to the other two student groups according to financial dependency, this is the highest share of students residing in student accommodation; and it is also considerably higher than the share among all students who live in student accommodation (17 %) (>Chapter 9).

### Students' expenditure for fees

*In seven out of 21 countries with available data, the majority of BA students pay fees*


In many countries, students – often supported by their families/partners – have to contribute to the financing of HEIs. The obligation to pay fees may impose a considerable burden on the students' budget. This burden may be alleviated, however, by public support. The following analysis investigates to what extent Bachelor students are, on the one hand, obliged to pay fees and, on the other hand, recipients of public support (Figure 8.5).

- In seven out of 21 countries with available data, the majority of Bachelor students pay fees. This holds for Switzerland, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Italy, Croatia, Slovakia, Armenia, and Ireland. In the first three countries, fees apply to almost all students, with shares of at least 93 % of fee-paying Bachelor students.
- In the rest of countries with available data, the group of fee-payers is a minority among Bachelor students. In Slovenia, Poland, Hungary, Latvia, and Lithuania, more

Figure 8.5

#### Bachelor students by obligation to pay fees and recipience of public support

*Bachelor students (living and not living with parents) who pay fees*



**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, G.13. **No data:** DE, FR, GE, NO, RO, RU, UA. **Too few cases:** SE.

**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 3.7 What are your average expenses for the following items during the current semester?

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** IT, NO.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

than one third of Bachelor students pay fees. In the Netherlands, Denmark, and the Czech Republic, it is less than a tenth of Bachelor students.

In all countries, Bachelor students who are paying fees can be divided into two groups of students: those who receive public support and those who do not. In most countries, it is common for a majority of fee-paying Bachelor students to not receive public support. This applies to 16 out of 21 countries.

- In Switzerland, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Italy, Croatia, Slovakia, Serbia, Austria, and the Czech Republic, the share of non-recipients of public support among fee-paying Bachelor students is particularly high (if the number of fee-paying Bachelor students is set at 100 %, more than 80 % of these students do not receive public support in the respective countries).
- By contrast, there are four countries – namely Armenia, Latvia, Montenegro, and Malta – in which the majority of Bachelor students liable to fees receive public support at the same time. In Latvia, this applies to more than 80 % of fee-paying Bachelor students.

Differences in fees can be linked to the type of HEI. In the following, average payments of students and their families/partners for fees are analysed, using the type of HEI – university vs. non-university – as main criterion for distinction (Figure 8.7). Only those countries with available data for both types of HEIs have been taken into account. Figure 8.7 displays for each country the average fee-differential between students at non-universities and at universities. For calculation of the differential, the average monthly amount of fees of students at universities was set at 100 % and the relative difference to the average monthly amount of fees of students at non-universities was calculated.

*In nine out of 18 countries, students at non-universities have on average higher monthly expenses for fees than their peers at universities*

Two groups of countries can be distinguished. In half of the countries (nine out of 18 countries), students at non-universities pay higher fees than their fellow students at universities.

- In Austria, Slovenia, Croatia, Poland, and Hungary, the average expense for fees paid by students at non-universities is at least twice as high as for students at universities.
- In Latvia, Switzerland, Serbia, and the Czech Republic, the difference varies between 13 % and 93 %.
- In Finland, students in neither of the two types of HEIs are charged with fees.
- In the group of countries comprising the Netherlands, Lithuania, Ireland, Estonia, Denmark, Armenia, Russia, and Bosnia-Herzegovina, students at non-universities have on average lower payments than their counterparts at universities. In the last three countries, average expenses for fees of students at non-universities are less than half as high as that of their peers at universities.


The data displayed in Figure 8.6 present a mixed picture. There is no unequivocal divide in the sense that average payments for fees are higher at one or the other type of HEIs in all countries. On the one hand, the level of fees charged by a HEI can be subject to various determinants, such as the institution's production costs (especially the costs of instruction), the availability of other funding sources (e.g. public funds, donations, and third-party funds), state regulations, the HEI's fundamental principle of action

Figure 8.6

**Fees to higher education institutions by type of higher education institution – students not living with parents**

Comparison of monthly fees paid by students and parents/partner/others to universities and non-universities

Difference between average fees in %



**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, F.2. **No data:** DE, FR, IT, NO, UA; students at non-universities: GE, ME, RO, SE, SK. **Too few cases:** Students at non-universities: MT. **EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 3.7 What are your average expenses for the following items during the current semester?

**Notes:** Values for fees of students at universities were set at 100 % to calculate the difference for fees of students at non-universities. In Romania, non-universities do not exist.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** IT, NO.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

(fulfilment of demand vs. realisation of profits) and its individual price policy. This may result in different levels of fees between universities and non-universities.

On the other hand, it may be that the level of fees at the two types of HEIs is the same, but there are differences in the shares of students who pay fees.


- In Austria, universities and universities of applied sciences (= non-universities) both may charge fees of € 363 per semester. But while universities charge only students who exceed the maximum study duration for more than a year, universities of applied sciences charge larger parts of their students. In addition, these institutions are entitled to charge cost-covering fees from international students, which are usually higher than € 363 per semester (Eurydice, 2014).
- In Slovenia and Poland, part-time students have to pay tuition fees (Eurydice, 2014). Their share at non-universities is markedly higher than at universities (in Slovenia: 35 % vs. 7 %; in Poland: 55 % vs. 20 %) (>Chapter 5).
- In Ireland, full-time EU-students in the first cycle are exempt from full tuition fees, if they meet the terms of the so-called “free fees scheme”. The majority of students in the second cycle, however, pay tuition fees (Eurydice, 2014). According to the EUROSTUDENT data, the share of Master students (= second cycle) at universities is clearly higher than at non-universities (19 % vs. 10 %, >DRM) which could explain the lower average expenses for fees of students at non-universities.
- In Estonia, study fees are generally regulated by the government. Fees are not regulated, however, for part-time studies (Eurydice, 2014), which means part-time students can be subject to higher fees. The share of part-time students at universities is higher than at non-universities (10 % vs. 8 %, >DRM), which could explain at least some part of the deviation of the average expenses for fees.

Figure 8.7

**Students' assessment of their financial situation**

Extent of current financial difficulties of all students

Students in %

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, F.6.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 3.8 To what extent are you currently experiencing financial difficulties?**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** DE, NO.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.**Students' assessment of their financial situation**

Although the EUROSTUDENT data set contains plenty of data on students' income and expenditures, it is not so easy to reflect upon students' material well-being. This is, inter alia, because no direct comparison of an individual students' income and expenditures can be performed on basis of aggregate data. This deficiency is counterbalanced, however, by provision of students' self-reported data on their financial situation. As part of the EUROSTUDENT survey, students were asked to what extent they currently experience financial difficulties. The respective answer scale contained five response options, ranging from "very seriously" to "not at all". The following figure displays all students' assessment of their financial situation (Figure 8.7).

On cross-country average, 19 % of students report to have serious current financial difficulties and another 11 % even state very serious difficulties. By contrast, 22 % of students report only slight financial difficulties and 18 % no difficulties at all.

■ In 10 countries, more than a third of students report to have either serious or very serious financial difficulties. This applies to Slovenia, Norway, Georgia, Ireland, Denmark, Croatia, Lithuania, Romania, Poland, and Montenegro.


Most of the countries in this group – except Norway, Ireland, and Denmark – would not be considered as being wealthy in terms of the GDP per capita. Accordingly, the total income of students in those countries is below the average of the EUROSTUDENT countries (>Chapter 7). Further, the income source with the single highest share in total income in these countries is either provisions from family/partner or students' self-earned income. This may indicate that students and their families/partners cannot provide sufficient means to keep large parts of the student body from encountering financial

**In 10 countries,  
more than a third  
of students report  
to have (very)  
serious financial  
difficulties**

Figure 8.8

**Students' assessment of their financial situation by finance-related characteristics – students not living with parents**

Students with (very) serious current financial difficulties



**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, F.9. **No data:** RU; students dependent on public support: GE, PL. **Too few cases:** Students dependent on own earnings: AM; students dependent on public support: AM, BA, CZ, HR, ME, MT, RS.

**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 3.8 To what extent are you currently experiencing financial difficulties?

**Notes:** Values above the country abbreviations present the percentage for students dependent on family support. For Lithuania the values for “dependent on own earnings” and “dependent on public support” are almost identical. Therefore, only one icon can be viewed in the figure.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** DE, IT, NO.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

difficulties. It seems a bit surprising, however, to find Denmark and Norway<sup>8</sup> in this group of countries. In both countries, the level of students' total income is above average of the EUROSTUDENT countries for various student groups. Both countries make use of public support schemes that i) reach large parts of the student population and ii) provide large shares of students' total income (>Chapter 7). These facts seem to point to advantageous systems from the students' perspective. Nevertheless, it seems that noticeable parts of the student populations currently experience financial problems. A more in-depth analysis on national level seems necessary to expose the causes for these results.

With respect to students' basic type of housing, it might be expected that those who live away from their parents report higher shares with (very) serious financial difficulties than those who live in their parental home. Indeed, in 20 out of 29 countries, higher shares of those with (very) serious financial difficulties are found among students not living with parents. The differences between the two student groups are quite pronounced, with at least seven percentage points difference, in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Finland, Italy, Malta, and the Netherlands. In nine countries, higher shares of students living with parents report (very) serious financial difficulties. The largest differences between the two student groups are found in Armenia (35 percentage points), Denmark (15 percentage points), and Georgia (12 percentage points) (>DRM).

8 The phrasing of the respective question and response options in the Norwegian questionnaire deviates from the EUROSTUDENT core questionnaire (see Notes on national surveys). This should be kept in mind when assessing the data.



It might be also insightful to review the assessment of their financial situation of students who depend on a specific income source. For the following analysis only those students have been taken into account who stated that they have either serious or very serious financial difficulties (Figure 8.8). The analysis is restricted to students not living with parents.

*The share of students with (very) serious financial problems is highest among those depending on public support*

The data displayed in the figure above show a clear picture: On average across countries, 29 % of students dependent on family support report to have (very) serious financial difficulties. The respective share among students dependent on own earnings is 33 % and it is highest among those who depend on public support with 38 %. Out of 20 countries that provided data on all three student groups, there are 12 countries in which students dependent on public support report the highest shares of those with (very) serious financial difficulties in comparison of the three student groups. The shares are especially high (more than two fifths of students) in Ireland, Romania, Norway, Lithuania, Ukraine, and Hungary. In Norway, half of the students dependent on public support are concerned and in Ireland it is more than two thirds. In five countries, namely Slovenia, Croatia, Denmark, Italy, and Germany, it is students dependent on own earnings with the highest shares reporting financial distress. With the exception of Germany, in all these countries the share of students affected is higher than a third of all students. In Sweden, Estonia, and Slovakia, students depending on family support report the highest shares with (very) serious financial problems. In Sweden and Estonia, about one third of students with a dependency on familial support are concerned and in Slovakia it is about one fourth.



## Discussion and policy considerations

Being able to come up with expenses for living and studying is the necessary financial condition for students to take up studies and successfully complete their participation in HE. Students and their families/partners dedicate, on cross-country average, more than four fifths of their combined expenses to students' living costs. Study-related costs absorb only about one sixth of total expenses. This holds roughly for both students living with parents and those not living with parents. This emphasizes that students' living costs are by far the greater financial obstacle that students and their families/partners have to take (see also Johnstone, 2013).

When analyzing specific cost components in more detail, it becomes apparent that accommodation including utilities is typically the most expensive expenditure item, especially for students not living with parents. When differentiating between several types of accommodation, it could be seen that students living with their partner/children have, on average across countries, the highest monthly expenses for accommodation. In contrast, student accommodation turns out to be the cheapest form of housing outside the parental home. In this respect, students depending on an income source show different spending behaviours. Those who depend on family support spend the highest average amount per month on accommodation, while their peers who are depending on own earnings pay slightly less for this purpose and students depending on public support have clearly the lowest spending on housing. The latter group is more often than average living in student accommodation ([Chapter 9](#)). As housing space seems to become increasingly scarce, especially in bigger cities, the provision of student accommodation may gain more importance, as this is a cost-effective instrument supplying students with the chance to live away from their parents' home at affordable prices. This is especially important for those students who have no choice but to leave their family home in order to attend an HEI.

Fees to HEIs are another important expenditure item, which may strain the students' budget considerably. Analyses by type of study programme bring to light that Bachelor students allocate only a marginally lower share of total expenses on fees than their peers in Master programmes. It shows that there are some considerable differences between countries with respect to policies on fees. In Switzerland, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Italy, Croatia, and Slovakia, a large majority of Bachelor students has to pay fees and at the same time does not receive public support. In Latvia, Montenegro, and Malta, only a minority of Bachelor students is charged with fees and a majority of those affected does receive public support. This can be viewed as different basic conceptions in which either the market-mechanism or the public sector plays a more prominent role. When looking at the relation between fees and the type of HEI it turns out that in half of the countries, students at non-universities have higher average expenses for fees than students at universities. The differences in average expenses for fees of students at universities and non-universities are, inter alia, due to different policies on fees (e.g. charging all students or only certain student groups) and different distributions of student groups across the two types of HEIs (e.g. part-time vs. full-time students).

It can be seen that fees are an expense factor that may put a considerable burden on the students' budget although they are often not charged with cost-covering fees. There is

empirical evidence that in the last two decades a worldwide trend of increasing per-student costs of instruction has emerged, although with varying degrees between and within countries. Furthermore, it seems that costs in HE increases at higher rates than available public funds (Johnstone, 2009). If this trend continues it could be one of the major challenges for the public sector in the countries forming part of the European Higher Education Area (EHEA), if one of the main goals of the social dimension - widening access for underrepresented groups (Bucharest Communiqué, 2012) - is to be accomplished.

When questioned about their overall financial situation, in almost all countries, the majority of students report to have currently at the most moderate financial difficulties. There is a group of 10 countries, however, in which more than a third of students notify to have either serious or very serious financial difficulties. Students not living with parents report more often financial distress than their peers who live with their parents. When looking at students not living with parents who depend on a specific income source, further insight is gained into the problem. On average across countries, 29 % of students dependent on family support report to have (very) serious financial difficulties. The respective share among students dependent on own earnings is 33 % and it is highest among those who depend on public support with 38 %. These results which indicate a rather high degree of financial distress or at least dissatisfaction of students receiving public support in a number of countries match earlier findings in this area (Orr et al., 2011). By their nature, the EUROSTUDENT data cannot provide information on students depending on public support who abandon their studies or potential students who abstain from taking up studies due to (the prospect of) insufficient financial means. However, this group of students seems to be exposed to a higher risk of doing so compared to other student groups with access to other financial sources. Therefore, a further investigation at the national level into the reasons for students' financial difficulties might be helpful in determining whether the extent of public support to students can be deemed appropriate in the respective countries.

# Tables

Table A8.1

## Composition of students' expenditure by payer and type of housing

Living costs and study-related costs as share of total monthly expenditure – students living with parents, total monthly expenditure (in %)

Country	Living costs paid by students	Living costs paid by parents/ partner/others	Study-related costs paid by students	Study-related costs paid by parents/partner/others
AM	10	56	4	29
AT	64	24	8	4
BA	8	71	1	20
CH	45	41	5	9
CZ	27	53	8	13
DE	–	–	–	–
DK	46	2	46	6
EE	49	46	3	3
FI	34	63	2	1
FR	60	40	–	–
GE	22	62	2	13
HR	38	41	13	8
HU	44	43	6	7
IE	41	28	10	22
IT	–	–	–	–
LT	34	55	4	6
LV	35	52	3	9
ME	24	56	6	14
MT	42	49	8	2
NL	43	22	19	16
NO	61	21	16	2
PL	47	44	6	4
RO	24	53	8	15
RS	13	71	2	14
RU	27	58	1	14
SE	46	49	4	0
SI	44	37	12	6
SK	39	54	5	2
UA	–	–	–	–

– no data

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, F.1. **No data:** DE, IT, UA; study-related costs: FR.

**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 3.7 What are your average expenses for the following items during the current semester?

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** FR.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

Table A8.2

**Profile of Master students' key expenditure – students not living with parents**

Expenditure paid by students and parents/partner/others, share of total monthly expenses (in %)

Country	Accommodation costs	Transportation costs	Costs for fees	Aggregated share of total expenditure
AM	15	4	31	50
AT	34	7	1	43
BA	34	5	19	58
CH	33	7	6	46
CZ	30	7	7	44
DE	32	7	–	39
DK	36	3	3	42
EE	25	8	4	37
FI	41	8	0	49
FR	52	7	–	59
GE	20	9	10	38
HR	32	6	14	52
HU	33	10	4	46
IE	33	7	20	60
IT	33	9	13	55
LT	28	8	7	43
LV	26	9	10	44
ME	23	6	21	50
MT	27	8	12	46
NL	37	4	15	55
NO	34	5	–	39
PL	35	6	5	46
RO	18	7	7	32
RS	32	8	13	52
RU	–	–	–	–
SE	41	6	3	50
SI	20	10	2	32
SK	24	10	4	38
UA	–	–	–	–

– no data

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, F.2. **No data:** RU, UA; fees: DE, FR, NO.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 3.7 What are your average expenses for the following items during the current semester?**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** DE, FR, IT, NO.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

Table A8.3

**Profile of students' key expenditure by educational background – students not living with parents**

Expenditure paid by students and parents/partner/others, share of total monthly expenses (in %)

Country	Students without HE background				Students with HE background			
	Accommodation costs	Transportation costs	Costs for fees	Aggregated share of total expenditure	Accommodation costs	Transportation costs	Costs for fees	Aggregated share of total expenditure
AM	28	5	26	59	20	4	24	48
AT	34	8	1	43	36	6	1	43
BA	34	6	14	54	33	6	14	53
CH	33	7	6	46	33	7	7	47
CZ	28	7	20	55	26	6	15	47
DE	34	8	–	42	34	7	–	41
DK	36	5	1	42	36	4	1	41
EE	25	9	4	38	27	8	5	40
FI	43	8	0	51	43	7	0	50
FR	53	7	–	60	54	6	–	60
GE	24	9	13	46	23	8	11	42
HR	30	7	12	49	33	6	14	53
HU	34	10	6	50	32	9	7	48
IE	38	8	15	61	36	7	20	63
IT	34	9	11	54	35	8	15	58
LT	26	8	9	43	29	9	9	47
LV	26	9	11	46	25	8	14	47
ME	28	5	16	49	27	7	15	49
MT	21	9	8	38	33	9	8	50
NL	37	3	14	54	37	3	15	55
NO	30	6	–	36	35	5	–	40
PL	36	6	6	48	36	6	4	46
RO	29	9	11	49	39	11	10	60
RS	29	6	8	43	29	6	10	45
RU	21	6	16	43	22	6	16	44
SE	40	7	1	48	41	6	1	48
SI	23	9	4	36	28	9	6	43
SK	25	10	4	39	24	10	3	37
UA	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

– no data

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, F.3. **No data:** UA; fees: DE, FR, NO.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 3.7 What are your average expenses for the following items during the current semester?**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** DE, FR, IT, NO.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

## Chapter 9

# Housing situation

### Key findings

- **Types of housing:** In most of the EUROSTUDENT countries, the majority of students are living away from their parents. At the same time, living with parents is in relative terms the most common form of housing in two thirds of the EUROSTUDENT countries. This form of housing is especially widespread in Armenia, Georgia, Italy, and Malta. Co-habiting with a partner and/or children is the prevailing form of housing in Austria, Estonia, and the Nordic countries. In Germany, Ireland, and Slovakia, the most common type of housing is shared accommodation with other persons. In France, the relative majority of students live alone.
- **Types of housing by age:** The realised form of housing seems to be related to students' age. Across countries, students tend with advancing age towards not living with their parents. The same holds for living in a shared accommodation with other persons. At the same time, the share of students living with partner/children increases with age. A similar pattern holds for students who live alone.
- **Student accommodation:** In about a third of EUROSTUDENT countries, more than a quarter of students live in student accommodation. Overall, student accommodation appears to be the preferred form of housing for students that are, on average, younger and more intensively involved in their studies. In most countries, students depending on public support appear to especially benefit from student quarters.
- **Commuting between home and higher education institution (HEI):** On average across all EUROSTUDENT countries, students spend more than one hour per day on their way to and from their HEI. Large differences according to the different types of housing can be found. In almost all countries, students living in student accommodation have the shortest commute when compared with all students and students living with parents. In about three quarters of EUROSTUDENT countries, the median commuting time between student accommodation and HEI does not exceed 15 minutes (one-way).
- **Students' satisfaction:** The overall satisfaction of students with their accommodation seems quite high. More than half of all students – those living with parents and those not living with parents – report to be satisfied or very satisfied with their housing situation in almost all countries. There are differences between basic forms of housing, however. On average across countries, 78 % of students who live with their parents report to be (very) satisfied, while the respective share for students not living with parents is 71 % and that of students living in student accommodation is only 60 %.

## Main issues

Housing can generally fulfil several needs. It does not only satisfy the need for shelter, but may also satisfy social needs, i.e. for integration, communication, and organisation of family life as well. For students, there is also a special type of housing that is supposed to be supportive for their academic lives. Thus, housing is a key element for living and studying.

### Forms of housing

Different factors may influence students' choices with regard to accommodation such as personal preferences, financial restrictions, and societal norms. On the one hand, societies differ in the expectations they have of students and young adults with regard to their independence from their parents and the propriety of different housing forms, so that one or the other form may become the norm from which few students deviate (see e.g. Luetzelberger, 2014). On the other hand, moving out of the parents' house and choosing one of the housing forms mentioned below may become inevitable when students wish to or have to attend higher education institutions (HEIs) which are far away from their home town; this may especially be the case for students from rural areas.

In some cases, the form of housing – especially when living with parents – is not so much a choice as a given. Still, the different forms of housing may be seen to reflect certain choices and background factors (Orr et al., 2011). The housing type “living alone”, for example, is often seen to be a reflection of the fact that the student is an adult, independent, and fully responsible for his/her life (if one does not consider parents' remaining financial responsibility in some countries). Students living with their partner and/or children are probably in a rather close and stable relationship and may also face certain financial responsibilities, especially in the presence of children.

The type of housing can be quite influential on the day-to-day organisation and experience of students. While all forms of housing have their characteristics that can be viewed either as advantages or disadvantages, they also have different implications for students' daily lives and the organisation of their studies.

### Student accommodation

With regard to students' finances and living situation, special attention will be paid to student accommodation as the typically least expensive form of housing available to students outside the parental home (>Chapter 8). Apart from the typically lower expenses, student halls of residence also offer students the possibility of socialising with other students, thus facilitating social integration and orientation (Schudde, 2011). Additionally, living with fellow students may be stimulating for intellectual development, be it study-related or not. This stimulation might be further encouraged by extra-curricular services and offerings provided by the higher education institution (HEI). When living in student accommodation, especially on-campus, it is likely that students see studying at a HEI as their main occupation in this period of their life which, as a consequence, may have a positive effect on their study duration and grades. The analyses in this chapter will investigate whether different student groups make use of student accommodation to varying extent.

## Commuting between home and HEI

A further advantage of student accommodation pertains to its location. Typically, student halls are located in close vicinity to HEIs. Besides convenience, this offers further money-saving possibilities for students living in this type of housing. While living with parents might be a good way to save directly on costs for accommodation, food, and other expense items, it may incur further costs related to commuting (transaction costs, Spiess & Wrohlich, 2010). Students may face a longer journey (in terms of distance and/or commuting time) from their home to the HEI than students who have deliberately chosen a particular place to live which may be closer to the institution.

A comparison of the commuting times of students living with their parents and students living in student accommodation will investigate whether a difference in commuting times can in fact be found. Additionally, the different modes of transportation used by students in the EUROSTUDENT countries will be analysed. A certain type of housing may also determine the possibilities of using different modes of transportation (e.g. students living with parents in the outer boroughs of a big city may not be able to reach their HEI by walking or bicycling). Furthermore, the mode of transportation is likely to influence the students' commuting time which needs to be taken account of in the planning of their personal time budgets.

## Students' satisfaction


Finally, this chapter will look at the satisfaction students themselves express with their housing situation. The accommodation type in which students ultimately live may simply express their preference for a certain type of housing. However, sometimes the realised option may not be what the students would in fact have preferred but rather a need-driven result which was influenced by limited residential properties and budget constraints. Students' satisfaction will be analysed with regard to students living with parents and not living with parents as well as students living in student accommodation.

## Methodological and conceptual notes

EUROSTUDENT analyses the housing situation of students during the week in the study term/semester (Monday until Friday). A main distinction used with regard to students' housing is that between students "living with parents" and students "not living with parents" (Figure 9.1).

**Figure 9.1**

**Types of student housing**





For students who are not living with parents, there is a further differentiation between the housing forms “alone”, “with partner/child(ren)” and “with other persons(s)”. Furthermore, a second main distinction is made between those students living in student accommodation and those not living in student accommodation. It is important to note that – depending on the offered facilities – students who reside in student accommodation can either live alone, with partner/child(ren), or with other person(s), just like their peers who live outside of student accommodation.

### Living with parents

“Living with parents” means that the student has indicated to be living with parents or other relatives. Besides biological parents, students might be living with step-parents, foster parents, or other relatives (e.g. grandparents, uncles, aunts). Cases of students living together with parents/relatives and other persons (e.g. with parents and partner), were assigned to the category “living with parents”.

### Living alone

This category captures students living by themselves, irrespective of the type of accommodation. That means the category contains students who, e.g., live alone in a private accommodation as well as those who live alone in a (public) student accommodation.

### Living with partner/child(ren)

This category comprises students living with their partner and/or children. Both categories were left open to definition by the students themselves, so that the term “partner” refers in a general way to the person the students are sharing their life with, irrespective of legal status (married or not married). In the same way, “children” may refer to biological children, adopted children, the partner’s children, etc. For this category both students who live in student accommodation and those who live outside of student accommodation are counted, as long as the criterion for living with partner and/or child(ren) is fulfilled.

### Living with other person(s)

Students who live in any sort of shared accommodation (inside or outside of student accommodation) were captured in the category “living with other person(s)”. According to the principle of mutual exclusiveness, students who live with parents, alone, or with partner and/or child(ren) were not assigned to this category.

### Living in student accommodation

This category includes all sorts of accommodation in dormitories or halls of residence that are especially – though maybe not exclusively – designated for the use of students in higher education (HE). It does not matter, whether the provider of the respective facility is from the private or the public sector. Students may live there by themselves or share the student accommodation with others (e.g. with partner/child(ren) or fellow students). The category “not student accommodation” accordingly captures all forms of housing outside such dormitories/halls of residence.

### Notes on national samples

In the case of Norway, there are two methodological aspects that are noteworthy.

- For the indicator “Form of housing” some students seem to have answered that they

live e.g. with partner and other person(s). Therefore, the total number of students is slightly exaggerated.

- For the indicator “Modes of transportation”, there is a rather large number of missing values.

### Strengths and limitation of the EUROSTUDENT data

Official statistics sometimes provide either no data on housing forms that are utilised by students in HE or only limited data that provide information solely on the number of students in public student accommodation. This deficiency is often – though not always – made up by student surveys on national level. Such surveys, however, do not take on an international perspective, which makes subsequent cross-country comparisons difficult, if not impossible for methodical reasons. Due to coherent survey conventions, EUROSTUDENT is able to provide data that are internationally comparable. Furthermore, our data provide information on topics such as students’ modes of transportation and commuting time that are directly related to the realised forms of housing. Finally, the EUROSTUDENT data bring the students’ satisfaction with different forms of housing to light. Due to the limited space of the EUROSTUDENT questionnaire, data on certain topics – like the students’ motivation for choosing a certain type of housing or on the size and quality of accommodation – that might be interesting as well cannot be provided.

## Data and interpretation

### Types of housing

In some EUROSTUDENT countries, a vast majority of students live in the same form of accommodation whereas in others the living situation is quite varied (Figure 9.2).

Out of four different types of housing, living with parents is the most common form of housing (i.e. the form with the single highest share among all students) in two thirds of the EUROSTUDENT countries.

- In nine countries (Armenia, Italy, Georgia, Malta, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Montenegro, Serbia, Russia, and Croatia), the majority of all students are living with parents. In the first four countries, this is especially common, with at least 70 % of students living in this form of housing. It is striking that this type of housing is widespread in South and South Eastern European countries, while it is rather unusual in the Nordic countries.

Although living with parents is the single most common form of housing out of the four types distinguished, in 20 out of 29 countries the majority of students are living away from their parents.


- Co-habiting with a partner and/or children is the most common form of housing in Estonia, Austria, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, and Finland. At least 40 % of students live this way in the Nordic countries. The rest of the students live mainly alone or with other people; living with parents is a form of housing that no more than 12 % of students in the Nordic countries use. These findings may be explained by the fact that these countries have some of the oldest student populations of all EUROSTUDENT countries (>Chapter 4).

*Living with parents is in relative terms the most common form of housing in two thirds of the EUROSTUDENT countries*

Figure 9.2

**Students' housing situation**

Share of students (in %)

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, E.1.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 3.1 Who do you live with during the study term/semester (Monday until Friday)?**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** NO.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

- In Slovakia, Ireland, and Germany, the most common form of housing is shared accommodation with other people. More than a third of students live this way in the three countries.
- France is the only country in which the largest share of students is living alone.

**Types of housing by age**

As already mentioned, the form of housing seems related to students' age, not only across countries, but also within. The type of housing for different age groups is shown for six countries that represent different parts of the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) (Figure 9.3).

**Across countries, students increasingly live with their partner/children with advancing age**


There are some patterns common to the countries: With rising age of students, the share of students living with parents generally decreases. This can be seen in all countries in Figure 9.3 except Poland. At the same time, the share of students living with partner and/or children increases. There is also a tendency for the share of students living with other person(s) to decrease with advancing age of students. For students who live alone, there seems to be no clear common pattern across the six countries. Overall, however, the share of students living alone seems to increase with age. These common patterns also hold on aggregate across the EUROSTUDENT countries (Table A9.1). The data suggest, inter alia, that with advancing age, students tend to leave the parental home and give up shared accommodation with others in order to establish their own families. Apart from such common patterns, there are also differences between the six countries.

- An idiosyncrasy in France is the high share of students living alone in all age groups. More than one third of students have chosen this form of housing and the share remains constant across the age groups.

Figure 9.3

## Form of housing by age groups for selected countries

Share of students (in %)



Data source: EUROSTUDENT V, E.2.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 3.1 Who do you live with during the study term/semester (Monday until Friday)?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions: NO.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: DE, GE, IT.

- Ireland is a country in which living with others is especially common among students. In every age group, Ireland shows the highest share of students utilizing this type of housing out of the six countries.
- Malta and Norway can be regarded as contrastive pairs with respect to students living with parents. In Malta, more than 90% of all students who are younger than 25 years live with their parents. In Norway, only about one fifth of students younger

than 22 years do so. In this respect, the two countries are representative for a pattern that separates Northern Europe from Southern Europe.

- Of the countries above, Poland is the only country with a tendency for the share of students who live with parents to increase with students' age.<sup>1</sup> This is plain to see for the oldest age group: more than half of all students who are 30 years and over live with their parents. This is also the second highest share in this age group out of all EUROSTUDENT countries. An international comparison of the income levels of students in this age group who live with parents shows that students in Poland have the third lowest average income per month (> DRM). It might be that during the course of studies, students who live away from parents encounter financial difficulties which force them to move back in their parental home. Another explanation might be that the older students have never left the parental home and are still staying there because the duration of their studies is especially long.<sup>2</sup>

When looking at the types of housing by students' education background, slight differences can be observed (Table A9.2). On aggregate across countries, students without HE background tend towards living with parents a bit less frequently than their counterparts with HE background (39 % vs. 41 %). The former group also slightly less often lives alone (13 % vs. 15 %). The largest difference between the two groups can be found for the housing form "living with partner/children": 23 % of students without HE background live this way but only 18 % of their fellow students with HE background do so. With respect to other forms of shared accommodation, the difference between the two groups is only marginal: 25 % of students without HE background live with other persons and the share for their counterparts is 26 %. To some extent the differences between the two groups will be related to age as well: On cross-country average, students without HE background are older than those with HE background (25 years vs. 24 years). Furthermore, the former group has also a larger variation in their age profile and in some countries, e.g., Finland, Ireland, and Norway, the age difference is much more pronounced (> Chapter 3).

## Student accommodation

**Student accommodation is the preferred type of housing for students who are rather young and study with high intensity**

Student accommodation is of varying quantitative relevance in the different EUROSTUDENT countries (Figure 9.4). In about a third of countries, more than a quarter of students live in student accommodation.

- This is the case in the Ukraine, Slovakia, Finland, Russia, the Netherlands, Latvia, Sweden, Slovenia, and Romania.
- By contrast, less than 10 % of all students live in student accommodation in Austria, Croatia, Switzerland, Serbia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Armenia, Malta, and Italy. Except for Austria and Switzerland, these latter countries are the ones in which the parental home houses especially large shares of students (50 % or more, Figure 9.2).

Living in student accommodation is apparently linked to students' age as well. On aggregate across countries, there is a clear pattern that the share of students in student accommodation decreases with age. The respective share diminishes steadily from


1 Another EUROSTUDENT country in which this pattern is apparent for the first three age groups is Montenegro (> DRM).

2 This may be due to different study framework conditions at the time they took up studies compared to their younger peers of today. Indeed, students in Poland who are 30 years and over have among all age groups the highest shares of those who study for a long national degree or in other postgraduate programmes (> DRM). Additionally, the Polish research team notes that local students more often tend to elongate their studies.

Figure 9.4

**Students living in student accommodation**

Share of students (in %)

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, E.1. **No data:** GE.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 3.2 Do you live in a student accommodation, i.e. dormitory or halls of residence?**Notes:** In GE student accommodation does not exist.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** NO.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

22 % in the age group “younger than 22 years” to 4 % in the age group “at least 30 years”. This linear pattern can also be found on the national level in the majority of EUROSTUDENT countries.

When looking at students residing in student accommodation by their educational backgrounds, on average across countries, there is no difference in the shares of students with and without HE background utilising student accommodation (18 % in each group). On a disaggregated level, the EUROSTUDENT countries can be roughly divided into three groups (Table A9.3).

- In the first group comprising 14 out of 28 countries with available data, at least slightly higher shares of students without HE background live in student accommodation than of students with HE background. The largest differences in the shares between the two student groups are found in Latvia, Slovenia, and the Ukraine, where the share of students without HE background living in student accommodation is more than six percentage points higher than that of their peers with HE background.
- In five countries, including Austria, Denmark, Italy, Poland, and Russia, there is either no or hardly any difference in the shares (i.e. any difference is less than one percentage point) of the two student groups utilising student housing.
- In nine countries – the Czech Republic, Finland, Germany, Ireland, the Netherlands, Norway, Slovakia, Sweden, and Switzerland – a higher share of students with HE background lives in student accommodation. In Finland, the Netherlands, and Sweden, the difference is larger than 10 percentage points.

It would be premature to interpret this finding as a bias against students without HE background, however. Most of the countries in the third group are characterised by a

relatively high average age of students. This holds especially for the Nordic countries but also for Ireland (>Chapter 4). Students without HE background tend to be even older (>Chapter 3 & 4) and more often they have entered HE with a delay (>Chapter 3). The group of delayed transition students has – out of all EUROSTUDENT focus groups (that are not defined by age) – the highest average age across countries (29 years, >DRM).

- The share of delayed transition students living in student accommodation exceeds 10 % in only nine countries, namely Estonia, Finland, France, Latvia, Norway, Romania, Russia, Sweden, and the Ukraine (>DRM).

As outlined above, with advancing age students tend towards living with partner/children. So, what seems to keep students without HE background from living in student accommodation (to a larger extent) appears to not be directly related to their background, but rather to a certain (previously established) lifestyle (>Chapter 4) that may not be well accommodated in typical student accommodation.

Further support to this interpretation is given by the finding that students living in student accommodation are especially often found among high-intensity students (>DRM).<sup>3</sup> In more than 90 % of EUROSTUDENT countries, the share of dwellers in student housing is above average among high-intensity students.

- When comparing the shares of residents in student accommodation between students with high and low intensity, it is apparent that in half the countries the share for high-intensity students is at least 10 percentage points higher (this holds for the Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, and Sweden).

Another student group to whom student accommodation appears to have particularly high importance is those depending on public support. In more than 90 % of EUROSTUDENT countries with available data, the share of students living in student accommodation is highest among those depending on public support (as opposed to students depending on own earnings or family support) (Figure 9.5).

Students depending on own earnings, in contrast, are the group that lives in student housing the least often in 22 of 24 countries with available data on all three student groups. In this respect it also shows that students depending on public support have, across countries, the highest share of students without HE background (54 %) in comparison of all three finance-related groups (>DRM).

Overall, student accommodation appears to be the preferred form of housing for students that are, on average, younger and more intensively involved in their studies. In most countries, students depending on public support appear to especially benefit from student quarters. This seems also related to the findings that students depending on public support are, in the relative majority of countries, the group most often living away from their parents compared to the other finance-related groups (>DRM). Student accommodation seems to offer a cost-effective alternative to these students with the lowest income (>Chapter 7), thus enabling them to leave the parental household.


<sup>3</sup> High-intensity students, by definition, spend more than 40 hours per week on study-related activities, i.e. on taught studies and personal study time. Low-intensity students spend no more than 20 hours per week on such activities.



Figure 9.5

## Students living in a student accommodation by dependency on income source

Share of students (in %)



**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, E.3. **No data:** GE; students dependent on public support: PL. **Too few cases:** Students dependent on own earnings: AM; students dependent on public support: AM, CZ, RU.

**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 3.2 Do you live in a student accommodation, i.e. dormitory or halls of residence?

**Notes:** Values above the country abbreviations present the percentage for students dependent on family support. In GE student accommodation does not exist.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** NO.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

## Commuting between home and HEI

Students spend quite some time getting from home to their place of HE and back again (Figure 9.6). Across all EUROSTUDENT countries and across all forms of housing, students spend more than one hour (mean value: 68 minutes) per day on their way to and from their HEI.

- Students in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Malta, Slovenia, Sweden, Montenegro, and Norway spend the least time on their daily commute. The median travel time for students in all forms of housing does not exceed 20 minutes (one-way), indicating that half of the students in these countries spend 20 minutes at most on one leg of their daily travel between their home and the HEI.

*In almost all EUROSTUDENT countries, students living in student accommodation have the shortest commuting times*

Large differences according to the different types of housing can be found. In all EUROSTUDENT countries (except for the Czech Republic), students living in student accommodation have the shortest commute when compared with all students and students living with parents. In almost three quarters of EUROSTUDENT countries, the median commuting time between student accommodation and HEI does not exceed 15 minutes (one-way). Students living with their parents have much longer commuting times: In no country is the median value for a one-way commute of students living with their parents lower than 25 minutes.


- In Russia, Ireland, Estonia, France, and Montenegro, commuting time between student accommodation and HEI is especially short with a one-way trip taking at most 10 minutes (median value). In Croatia, the Czech Republic, and Romania, students need at least 25 minutes to get from their student housing to the HEI (median value).



Figure 9.6

**Type of housing and daily time for commuting from home to higher education institution (one-way)**

Median one-way commuting time (in minutes)



**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, E.7. **No data:** DE, IT; student accommodation: GE. **Too few cases:** Student accommodation: MT.

**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 3.1 Who do you live with during the study term/semester (Monday until Friday)?, 3.2 Do you live in a student accommodation, i.e. dormitory or halls of residence?, 3.5 On a typical day, how much time does it take you to get from your home to your higher education institution during the current semester?

**Notes:** In GE student accommodation does not exist.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

- Students living with their parents in the Netherlands, Czech Republic, Hungary, Switzerland, and Austria have, in international comparison, the longest commutes. Half of them spend at least 45 minutes to travel to their HEI from their parents' home.
- Students living in student accommodation in the Netherlands, Russia, and Ireland save the most time on their commute in comparison to their peers living in their parents' homes: The median travel time (one-way) between the place of residence and the HEI is – for students living with parents – at least four times as high as for their peers in student accommodation.

Commuting times are not only influenced by the distance between home and HEI but also by the mode of transportation used. With respect to the following figure, students were asked about the mode of transportation that they use most frequently to get from their home to the HEI. In the EUROSTUDENT countries, public transport is the most often used mode of transportation by students in 21 out of 26 countries (Figure 9.7).

- More than two thirds of students most frequently rely on public transport to get to the HEI in Georgia, Armenia, the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Switzerland. Less than a third of students do so in Slovenia, Denmark, Ireland, Malta, and Montenegro. Across all EUROSTUDENT countries with available data, the average share of students who most frequently use public transport for their commute is 49%.


On average across all EUROSTUDENT countries, walking is the second most widespread form of commuting. In half of the EUROSTUDENT countries, at least a quarter of all students name walking as the most frequent way of getting to the HEI.

- In Armenia, the Netherlands, Denmark, and Malta, by contrast, less than 10% of students frequently walk to class.

Figure 9.7

## Most frequently used mode of transportation

Share of students (in %)



Data source: EUROSTUDENT V, E.8. No data: AT, DE, IT; other: CH.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 3.4 What is your most frequently used mode of transportation to get from your home to your HE institution during the current semester?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions: NO.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: DE, GE, IT.

■ In the Netherlands and Denmark, students appear to prefer riding their bicycles instead. Along with Sweden and Finland, these countries have relatively high shares of students who indicate that they most frequently use a bike to get to their HEI. At least every fifth student has named bicycling as their most frequently used mode of transport in these countries.

In the other EUROSTUDENT countries, bicycling is not as popular a means of commuting – on average across all countries, only about 8% of students most frequently travel to their HEI this way.

Motorised means of transport such as cars or motorcycles are used somewhat more frequently. On average across all EUROSTUDENT countries with available data, around every fifth student most frequently takes a car/motorcycle to get to the HEI.

■ At least a quarter of students most frequently uses a car or motorbike to reach the HEI in Lithuania, France, Estonia, Slovenia, and, with much larger shares, in Ireland and Malta.

The median commuting time for all forms of accommodation (Figure 9.6) tends to be higher in countries in which more students use public transport. In the twelve EUROSTUDENT countries in which more than half of students most frequently rely on public transport, the median commuting time is 30 minutes in 10 of the countries. In the 14 countries in which less than half of all students most frequently use public transport, the commuting time for all forms of accommodation is 20 minutes (median) or less in 10 of those countries. The travel time exceeds 25 minutes only in one country.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>4</sup> The case in point being the Netherlands, in which the higher median commuting time might be explained by the high shares of students using bicycles.

When looking at the relation between student accommodation and the mode of transportation, it becomes apparent that in those countries in which large shares of the student populations make use of student accommodation (Ukraine, Slovakia, Finland, Russia, the Netherlands, Latvia, Sweden, Slovenia, and Romania, Figure 9.4) also large parts of the students either walk or ride a bicycle to get to the HEI. In the countries mentioned above, the share of students who most frequently walk ranges between 22 % in Latvia and 33 % in Russia. Only in the Netherlands and Sweden is the share lower, but in these countries bicycling is the most frequent mode of transportation for many students (in the Netherlands: 34 %, Sweden: 27 %). As students in student accommodation have in almost all countries the shortest commuting time (Figure 9.6), the data suggest that student accommodation is in close vicinity to the HEI, allowing students to use modes of transport that are not only cheap but also environmentally friendly.

### Students' satisfaction

*Students living in student accommodation show across countries the comparatively lowest level of satisfaction*

How satisfied are students with their housing situation in the EUROSTUDENT countries? On average across countries, about three quarters of all students – both those living with parents as well as those not living with parents – report to be either satisfied or very satisfied with their housing situation (Figure 9.8).

- With regard to students living with their parents, the highest shares of satisfied students can be found in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Malta, Serbia, and Italy. In these countries, 90 % or more of the students indicate that they are (very) satisfied with their housing situation.
- Among students not living with their parents, the highest shares of (very) satisfied students can be found in Malta, Norway, Sweden, the Netherlands, and Finland. At least 80 % of the students living away from the parental home are (very) satisfied with their housing situation.

When looking at differences in satisfaction among students living with parents and students not living with parents, three groups of countries can be identified:



- In the first group of countries, hardly any difference can be found with regard to satisfaction among students who live with their parents and those who do not. Malta, Norway, Sweden, and Estonia belong to this group. In these countries, the shares of (very) satisfied students do not differ by more than three percentage points.
- In the second group of countries, comprising the Netherlands, Switzerland, Finland, Russia, Denmark, Germany, and Austria, higher rates of satisfaction of students can be found among those who are not living with their parents. The difference between the shares of (very) satisfied students is at least six percentage points in all of these countries; in Finland and Austria, the difference is even greater than 20 percentage points.
- In the third group which contains 16 countries, students who are living with their parents report higher rates of satisfaction. In these countries, the share of (very) satisfied students among students living with parents is more than five percentage points higher than among students who do not live with their parents. In Bosnia-Herzegovina, Montenegro, Slovakia, Romania, Ukraine, and Armenia, the difference is larger than 20 percentage points.

Students' satisfaction seems to be related to the predominant form of housing in a country. In countries in which at least 50 % of students live with their parents, higher

Figure 9.8

## Satisfaction with housing by type of housing

Share of (very) satisfied students (in %)



**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, E.1, E.5. **No data:** Assessment of students in chart a): HU, SI; for chart b): GE. **Too few cases:** Assessment of students in chart b): MT.

**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 3.1 Who do you live with during the study term/semester (Monday until Friday)?, 3.2 Do you live in a student accommodation, i.e. dormitory or halls of residence? 3.3 How satisfied are you with your accommodation?

**Notes:** In GE student accommodation does not exist.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** NO.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

shares of (very) satisfied students can be found in this student group than among students not living with parents in almost all countries. By contrast, low shares of satisfaction with the housing form “living with parents” are apparent in countries in which this form of housing is not very common (Finland, Denmark, Germany, and Austria). Exceptions to this pattern are presented in Norway and Sweden, where

relatively few students live with their parents but those that do are just as satisfied as their peers living away from their parents, and Russia, where half of the students live with their parents but higher shares of (very) satisfied students can be found among those living without their parents.

Students living in student accommodation are, on average, clearly less satisfied than all students not living with parents and students living with parents. On average across all EUROSTUDENT countries with data available, 60% of students living in student residences report to be (very) satisfied, while the respective share for all students not living with parents is 71% and that for students who live with their parents is 78%.

■ Above-average levels of satisfaction among students in student accommodation can be found in Serbia, Italy, Ireland, Norway, Sweden, Estonia, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Finland, Denmark, Hungary, and Slovenia.

Compared to all students who are not living with parents, students living in student accommodation are less (very) satisfied in all countries except Italy and Armenia. That means other forms of housing outside the parental home, i.e. living with partner/children, with other persons, or alone, are rated more positively by students.

## Discussion and policy considerations

Living with parents is in relative terms the most common form of housing in two thirds of the EUROSTUDENT countries. The geographical spread of students living with parents replicated the North-South divide that has been extensively discussed in previous studies (e.g., Buchmann & Kriesi, 2011; Kuhar & Reiter, 2014), with students in Southern European countries appearing to stay at their parents' home much longer than students in Northern European countries. It remains to be seen whether the effects of the economic crisis will exacerbate this phenomenon by prolonging students' residence in the parental home even further (see Cairns, 2011, for an analysis of Portuguese students). Living with parents may be viewed as a cost-saving and comfortable type of housing for students – it may restrict, however, the students' choice of HEI. If living with parents is for some students the only type of accommodation that is financially compatible with studies, those students may be at a disadvantage compared to their peers who can choose a HEI without being bound by their parental home (see Spiess & Wrohlich, 2010; Frenette, 2006). In this context, the countries forming part of the EHEA may want to review whether students, especially from low social backgrounds, are not exposed to social inequality in the choice of HEIs due to strong limitations in accommodation forms.

The investigation of students living in student accommodation has shown that this form of residence seems to be the preferred form of housing for students that are, on average, younger and more intensively involved in their studies. In most countries, students depending on public support especially appear to profit from designated student accommodation, which is at the same time supportive for students without HE background, who are more often dependent on public support than on family support or own earnings. In this way, student accommodation may serve an important function for students, helping them to better *'overcome the contrasts between their home communities*

and student life' (p. 515) than if they were living at home, as suggested by Holdsworth (2006). Further, students living in student accommodation have the shortest commute in almost all countries, indicating that those students are able to live in close vicinity to the HEI attended.

Overall, public transport is the most often used mode of transportation by students in 21 out of 26 countries. Additionally, in half of the EUROSTUDENT countries, at least a quarter of students name walking as their most frequent way of getting to the HEI. Besides these overall patterns, it became apparent in the analyses of students' means of transportation that country-specific traditions seem to exist. Further policy-relevant insight might be gained at the institutional level by conducting analyses at individual HEIs to gain more insight into what drives students' choice of travel mode (see Delmelle & Delmelle, 2012). Whalen, Pérez, and Carrasco (2013), for example, could show that university students' choice of travel mode is influenced by a combination of factors, namely costs, individual attitudes, and environmental factors. The EUROSTUDENT data also point towards the fact that students living in student accommodation may make stronger use of modes of transportation (walking and bicycling) that are cost-saving and environmentally friendly.

Students' satisfaction with their housing situation is rather high on average across countries, although there are some differences with regard to the forms of housing. About three quarters of all students – both those living with parents as well as those not living with parents – are (very) satisfied with their current housing situation across countries. Students living in student accommodation are, on average, clearly less satisfied than students living away from their parents in other forms of housing and students living with parents. Only three fifths of students in student accommodation state that they are (very) satisfied with their lodging. Student accommodation appears to be an ambivalent form of housing: On the one hand, it is across countries the cheapest form of housing outside the parental home in terms of accommodation costs (> [Chapter 8](#)). Furthermore, it seems that this type of housing is often in spatial proximity to the HEI attended, allowing students to use modes of transportation that are likewise cost-saving and eco-friendly. On the other hand, student accommodation does not seem to be an especially popular form of housing in most countries. A lower level of satisfaction seems to be an additional price students currently have to pay. Any improvement of the situation of students in student accommodation, however, requires an on-site analysis of the underlying major problems, which may differ not only between countries, but also within.

# Tables

Table A9.1

## Students' housing situation by age groups

Share of students (in %)

Country	With parents				Alone				With partner/child(ren)				With other person(s)			
	< 22 yrs.	22 < 25 yrs.	25 < 30 yrs.	≥ 30 yrs.	< 22 yrs.	22 < 25 yrs.	25 < 30 yrs.	≥ 30 yrs.	< 22 yrs.	22 < 25 yrs.	25 < 30 yrs.	≥ 30 yrs.	< 22 yrs.	22 < 25 yrs.	25 < 30 yrs.	≥ 30 yrs.
AM	84	77	85	55	5	8	5	13	1	4	9	31	9	11	1	1
AT	33	21	12	4	29	28	29	34	12	23	37	56	26	28	22	5
BA	57	62	60	30	11	12	11	14	2	4	8	50	30	23	22	7
CH	63	54	32	8	12	10	16	21	3	8	24	57	23	28	28	13
CZ	41	36	27	7	4	5	14	17	12	25	41	75	43	35	19	2
DE	34	25	17	9	21	22	23	24	6	14	27	53	39	40	33	15
DK	20	7	2	1	30	30	28	21	17	31	47	70	33	32	24	8
EE	36	33	23	10	15	16	18	14	18	28	44	71	31	23	15	5
FI	11	5	3	0	44	41	37	25	20	36	47	67	25	18	14	8
FR	42	26	17	5	36	39	36	37	7	18	31	50	15	17	16	8
GE	72	69	65	•	12	14	11	•	3	6	23	•	12	10	2	•
HR	52	53	50	23	13	15	13	12	2	3	18	52	33	30	19	13
HU	50	48	43	16	4	5	10	11	4	10	26	69	42	37	21	4
IE	49	45	27	10	1	2	7	13	2	7	31	65	48	46	34	12
IT	78	78	71	42	4	5	8	14	0	1	4	41	18	16	17	3
LT	39	40	27	16	7	9	10	16	10	22	43	60	44	29	20	9
LV	42	42	26	22	10	8	18	19	12	24	46	56	36	26	11	3
ME	55	56	58	32	15	16	14	12	5	5	17	51	26	24	11	5
MT	91	92	54	19	2	1	10	13	2	4	32	66	5	4	5	2
NL	54	31	17	2	10	16	23	18	5	16	36	76	32	37	25	4
NO	21	10	5	1	21	26	23	16	19	29	48	77	39	36	24	5
PL	41	38	43	51	7	8	10	9	20	25	30	31	32	29	17	9
RO	38	42	37	13	9	8	11	11	12	11	30	73	41	39	22	2
RS	54	54	56	30	15	15	14	14	2	3	14	53	28	28	16	4
RU	51	52	29	42	7	9	21	18	7	14	26	39	35	26	25	0
SE	35	12	5	1	36	43	40	19	15	32	46	78	14	13	9	2
SI	43	43	44	21	4	5	4	9	6	10	22	63	48	43	29	8
SK	40	39	39	13	2	3	8	7	5	12	30	74	53	46	23	6
UA	45	40	–	–	6	12	–	–	5	15	–	–	44	34	–	–

– no data • too few cases

Data source: EUROSTUDENT V, E.2.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 3.1 Who do you live with during the study term/semester (Monday until Friday)?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions: NO.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: DE, GE, IT.

Table A9.2

**Students' housing situation by educational background**

Share of students (in %)

Country	With parents		Alone		With partner/child(ren)		With other person(s)	
	Without HE background	With HE background	Without HE background	With HE background	Without HE background	With HE background	Without HE background	With HE background
AM	80	83	6	6	2	2	12	9
AT	19	17	29	31	33	26	20	27
BA	53	64	9	14	6	5	32	17
CH	46	40	12	14	21	17	21	30
CZ	33	32	7	8	32	26	28	34
DE	27	20	22	22	20	18	32	39
DK	6	6	26	28	47	38	21	28
EE	21	31	14	17	44	34	21	19
FI	4	4	32	39	54	38	10	19
FR	37	32	36	38	15	13	13	18
GE	71	71	10	14	6	5	14	11
HR	49	51	10	18	10	5	30	26
HU	42	45	5	7	22	15	30	33
IE	33	39	6	4	27	17	34	40
IT	76	74	5	7	4	2	16	18
LT	31	37	8	9	27	20	35	34
LV	33	43	11	11	24	19	32	28
ME	55	51	11	18	10	14	24	17
MT	68	72	6	6	22	20	4	2
NL	41	31	13	16	24	17	22	36
NO	9	8	20	22	58	39	14	31
PL	43	37	7	9	24	24	26	30
RO	39	40	8	12	15	15	38	33
RS	47	59	15	15	8	7	30	19
RU	48	51	6	9	16	8	30	32
SE	13	11	27	38	54	40	7	11
SI	37	42	3	6	20	13	40	39
SK	37	38	3	4	18	11	42	47
UA	37	48	5	7	7	6	51	39

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, E.2.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 3.1 Who do you live with during the study term/semester (Monday until Friday)?**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** NO.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.



Table A9.3

**Student accommodation by educational background**

Share of students (in %)

Country	Living in student accommodation		Not living in student accommodation	
	Without HE background	With HE background	Without HE background	With HE background
AM	10	4	90	96
AT	9	9	91	91
BA	7	4	93	96
CH	6	9	94	91
CZ	18	22	82	79
DE	10	11	90	89
DK	11	11	90	89
EE	20	16	80	84
FI	25	39	75	61
FR	14	12	86	88
GE	–	–	–	–
HR	9	7	91	93
HU	22	21	78	79
IE	10	13	90	87
IT	2	2	98	98
LT	25	23	75	77
LV	33	26	67	74
ME	12	9	88	91
MT	3	1	97	99
NL	20	37	80	63
NO	13	16	87	84
PL	12	12	88	88
RO	28	24	72	76
RS	9	5	91	95
RU	30	30	70	70
SE	21	33	79	67
SI	31	25	69	76
SK	35	39	65	61
UA	48	37	52	63

– no data

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, E.2. **No data:** GE.**Notes:** In GE student accommodation does not exist.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 3.1 Who do you live with during the study term/semester (Monday until Friday)?**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** NO.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

## Chapter 10

# Mobility and internationalisation

### Key findings

- **International student mobility rates and plans:** Between 5 % and 39 % of students in the cross-sectional EUROSTUDENT samples have realised an enrolment, an internship, a language course or another study-related experience abroad. Enrolment abroad tends to be the most frequently realised foreign study-related experience. Judging by the share of students who plan to go abroad, the potential to further increase the foreign enrolment rate seems to be particularly high in Armenia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, Georgia, Serbia, Slovakia, and Ukraine.
- **Selectivity of foreign enrolment:** International student mobility is socially selective: In all countries but Armenia, Serbia, and Ukraine, the share of students who have studied abroad is higher among students with higher education background than among students without higher education background. Moreover, the shares of students having realised an internship or a language course tend to be higher among students with higher education background. Foreign enrolment rates also differ by field of study. They tend to be particularly low among students of teacher training and education science.
- **Obstacles to enrolment abroad:** The most critical of the analysed obstacles to studying abroad are the associated additional financial burden and the separation from partner, children, and friends. Less critical are insufficient foreign language skills, expected problems with the recognition of credits gained abroad and a lack of information provided by the home institution.
- **Organisation of enrolment periods abroad:** The organisation of foreign enrolment periods varies strongly across countries, but overall, EU programmes constitute the main route to study abroad. In the majority of countries, they are used by more than half of the students who study abroad temporarily.
- **Funding for an enrolment abroad:** Overall, public sources and means from parents, family, or partner tend to be the primary sources of funding for enrolment periods abroad, followed by income from jobs. Although familial support is not always the primary source, large shares of students receive at least some familial support in most countries, especially among students with higher education background.
- **Recognition of credits:** In 19 out of 26 EUROSTUDENT countries, more than 70 % of students who gained credits during an enrolment abroad had them either fully or partly recognised upon return. In Armenia, Russia, and Ukraine, comparatively large shares of students have not had their credits recognised (yet).
- **Foreign languages:** The share of students with (very) good proficiency in at least two foreign languages varies massively across countries. Students with higher education background tend to have better self-assessed foreign language skills than their peers without higher education background. In most EUROSTUDENT countries, less than 10 % of students are enrolled in a study programme which is taught in a foreign language.

## Main issues

The international mobility of students continues to be a focus area of higher education policy in Europe. At the 2012 Ministerial Conference in Bucharest, the European ministers responsible for higher education have underlined this by adopting the Mobility Strategy 2020 for the European Higher Education Area (EHEA). The ongoing interest in this topic is also reflected in a growing body of research on access, obstacles, and returns to international student mobility.

### Participative equity in international mobility

Evidence is mounting that international mobility during studies may have positive impacts on students' personality development and later employment prospects (Messer & Wolter, 2007; Wiers-Jenssen, 2011; Netz, 2012; Rodrigues, 2013; Zimmermann & Neyer, 2013). Ensuring that different groups of students have similar opportunities of becoming internationally mobile and thus of reaping the benefits of international student mobility is therefore an important goal of higher education policy-makers. In fact, the ministers responsible for higher education have promised to 'give extra attention and opportunities to under-represented groups to be mobile' (EHEA Mobility Strategy, 2012, p. 3). Against this background, Chapter 10 examines the extent to which different groups of students realise different types of international student mobility. Special emphasis is placed on differences by students' educational background, as it is known to influence not only the transition into higher education but also decision-making within higher education (> [Chapter 3](#)). Moreover, differences in mobility rates by sex and field of study are considered.

### Obstacles to mobility

The EHEA Mobility Strategy (2012, p. 3) acknowledges that 'there is still a series of obstacles on different levels which impact on the substantial expansion of mobility inside and outside the EHEA'. Intending to inform this debate and complement other policy-relevant studies on obstacles to mobility (e.g. Doyle et al., 2010; Netz, 2013; Souto-Otero et al., 2013; van Mol & Timmerman, 2013), this chapter presents an up-to-date picture of students' perceptions of obstacles to an enrolment period abroad.

### Organisation, financing and recognition of mobility

Students' assessment of obstacles to mobility is followed by a more objective analysis of how they actually organise and finance their enrolment periods abroad. Moreover, the extent to which their periods of enrolment abroad are recognised at home is investigated.

### Foreign language proficiency


As they are both an important prerequisite and a desired outcome of international mobility, students' foreign language skills are examined. Special attention is paid to differences in foreign language skills by educational background.

### Internationalisation at home

While desirable, it is unlikely that all students can spend part of their studies abroad. For students not having the opportunity to go abroad, elements of internationalisation at home may be attractive, i.e. learning arrangements that allow students to improve

## Box 10.1

## Types of temporary international student mobility



their foreign language skills and to gain experience in culturally diverse settings (Wächter, 2003). Internationalisation at home may not only be an alternative to physical mobility, but it can also be regarded as a preparation for later physical mobility. As an important example of internationalisation at home, this chapter briefly looks at the extent to which students' national study programmes are taught in foreign languages. This element of internationalisation at home can not only help students to improve their own foreign language skills, but also to attract students from abroad which would allow both national and foreign students to get in touch with foreign cultures.

## Methodological and conceptual notes

### Definition and types of international student mobility

The analyses presented in this chapter focus on phases of temporary international mobility of returning students, i.e. students who continue their studies at their home institution after a stay abroad. Within the EUROSTUDENT framework, this type of international student mobility is referred to as study-related experiences abroad or as foreign study-related experiences.<sup>1</sup> So-called diploma or degree mobility (Kelo et al., 2006; Teichler et al., 2011), which describes international mobility with the aim of completing an entire course of studies in a country other than the one where the higher education entrance qualification was obtained, is not subsumed under the term study-related experience abroad and not dealt with in this chapter. However, plans for international degree mobility were captured in the fifth round of EUROSTUDENT and are examined in >Chapter 11.

As Box 10.1 illustrates, different types of study-related experiences abroad are considered in the national EUROSTUDENT surveys: enrolment abroad/foreign enrolment, internships/work placements, language courses, research stays, summer schools, and other study-related experiences abroad.

<sup>1</sup> These two terms are used interchangeably. In other studies on student mobility, study-related experiences abroad are referred to as credit mobility (Kelo et al., 2006; Teichler et al., 2011). In terms of the types of stays abroad captured, the concept of a study-related experience abroad is largely congruent with the notion of credit mobility. However, in contrast to credit mobility, a study-related experience abroad is not necessarily undertaken with the intention of gaining credit.

## Obstacles to enrolment abroad

For the analysis of obstacles to an enrolment period abroad, students were asked to rate possible obstacles on a five-point scale ranging from “no obstacle” to “big obstacle”. The shares of students considering an aspect as either a (4) “quite big obstacle” or a (5) “big obstacle” were then aggregated. Five potential obstacles to an enrolment period abroad are examined in this chapter: the additional financial burden associated with studying abroad, the separation from partner, child(ren) and friends, insufficient foreign language skills, expected problems with the recognition of credits gained abroad, and a lack of information provided by the home institution. These were selected to represent different dimensions in which students may perceive obstacles to mobility: a financial, a social, a performance-related, a systemic, and an institutional dimension. The analysis in this chapter focuses on the perceptions of students who have not been enrolled abroad and do not plan to enrol abroad.

## Organisation of enrolment periods abroad

For the analysis of how enrolment periods abroad are organised, three possible alternatives were considered: EU programmes (mainly comprising ERASMUS scholarships), other programmes (primarily scholarships from national programmes), and enrolments without a programme, which were thus organised on students’ own initiative. In the rare cases that students had realised more than one foreign enrolment period, they were asked to refer to their most recent enrolment abroad.

## Funding of enrolment periods abroad

In order to analyse how foreign enrolment periods are financed, different sources of funding were captured. Means from parents, family, or partner were differentiated from the three aggregated categories “public sources” (summarising the items regular grants/loans from home country, special grants/loans from home country for going abroad, study grants/loans from host country, and EU study grants), “income from job(s)” (including income from job before and income from job during the enrolment abroad), and “other sources” (comprising funds from private businesses or NGOs as well as yet other sources). Firstly, students were asked to indicate their primary source of funding for their enrolment abroad. The primary source is the one which made up the largest share of the total funds needed. Secondly, students were asked to indicate which different sources they have utilised, i.e. from which sources they drew at least some money for financing their stay abroad. In case students had realised more than one foreign enrolment period, they were asked to refer to their most recent enrolment abroad.

## Recognition of credits gained during an enrolment abroad

The degree of recognition of credits gained during an enrolment period abroad was captured through a question having five response options: “full recognition of credits”, “partial recognition of credits”, “no recognition of credits”, “don’t know (yet)” and “no credits were gained abroad”. In calculating the results, the option “no credits were gained abroad” was not considered and the remaining four categories were rescaled to 100 %. This was done to exclude enrolment periods abroad that students realised without an intention to gain credits. Including such stays would cause recognition rates to appear lower than they actually are. In case students had realised more than one foreign enrolment period, they were asked to give account of the recognition of their most recent enrolment abroad.

## Foreign language proficiency

In the fifth round of EUROSTUDENT, the definition of foreign language skills does not comprise mother tongues if these are official languages of the country of study. Proficiency in a country's official language is thus only counted as foreign language skills if this language is not the student's mother tongue. The analysis of foreign language skills is based on the self-assessment of students and not on external proficiency tests. It focuses on the share of students who indicated to have an either "good" or "very good" proficiency in two or more foreign languages. This indicator was defined against the background of an EU target, which stipulates that in the long run, all European citizens shall develop decent skills in two languages besides their mother tongue (European Commission, 2005).<sup>2</sup>

## Language of domestic study programme

In the analysis of the languages that students' domestic study programmes are (mainly) taught in, foreign languages were defined to exclude the national and regional official language(s) of a country. In Malta, for instance, both Maltese and English were not regarded as foreign languages even though they might not be considered mother tongues by all students. As the intention was to obtain an indicator for internationalisation at home, the analysis refers to the teaching language(s) in students' national study programmes. Parts of study programmes that students may have followed in a foreign language during a stay abroad are not considered.

## Strengths and shortcomings of EUROSTUDENT data

A major strength of EUROSTUDENT data is that they capture different types of international mobility for various countries. No other European study involving so many countries describes mobility phases of students in such a detailed manner.

Further strengths and shortcomings of EUROSTUDENT data become evident when looking at the characteristics of student surveys as opposed to graduate surveys. Graduate surveys have the advantage of tracking students' experiences throughout the entire study biography. Therefore, they can provide a better estimation of the rate of students who have been internationally mobile during their studies. In contrast, cross-sectional student surveys such as EUROSTUDENT address students during their ongoing studies. As students can still go abroad after having been surveyed, student surveys tend to underestimate the eventual mobility rate of graduates.<sup>3</sup> However, they still provide a picture of general differences in mobility rates between countries and groups of students.

Moreover, student surveys have the advantage of generating information about students' plans for future mobility. This allows for a prospective description of the potential mobility rate at graduation.

Finally, student surveys ask students about their current situation and perception of obstacles to mobility as well as about events that mainly date back only a few months

<sup>2</sup> Clearly, the EUROSTUDENT definition sets the bar for evaluation somewhat higher than originally intended by the European Commission and the Council of the European Union. However, it should also be noted that the target refers to the broad population and not to students in higher education, who might be expected to have comparatively better foreign language skills.

<sup>3</sup> Graduate surveys may estimate mobility rates imprecisely as well: They are more likely than student surveys to miss students who leave their home institution to complete the last phase of their studies abroad, which is common e.g. in the case of joint degree programmes. Similarly, they do not capture students who abandon their studies shortly before graduation.

or semesters. The time lags between the events of interest and the survey tend to be shorter than in the case of graduate surveys. Student surveys thus constitute valuable sources of up-to-date information for policy-makers.

### Notes on national surveys

With regard to some indicators, the data of individual countries are of limited comparability due to deviations from the EUROSTUDENT survey conventions.

- In some countries, the procedure for capturing study-related experiences abroad was not entirely in line with the EUROSTUDENT survey conventions. The Swiss questionnaire only asked for foreign enrolment periods during the current programme, thereby excluding temporary enrolments abroad during previous study programmes. In France, a focus was placed on foreign enrolment in the context of mobility programmes, which might have led to an exclusion of foreign enrolment realised without mobility programmes. Moreover, the foreign enrolment rates for Finland may also comprise some study programmes completed entirely abroad (degree mobility). Finally, the shares of students planning to enrol abroad are underestimated in Austria due to the filtering solution found in the online survey (see >DRM for details).
- Some countries used slightly different labels for the scales capturing students' assessment of obstacles to mobility (Denmark, Germany, Switzerland, and Russia). In Austria and France, a yes/no scale instead of a five-point scale was used. Unlike all other data from the Netherlands, the data on perceived obstacles to mobility stem from the 2014 and not from the 2013 student survey.
- Some countries did not include the full list of sources of funding suggested in the EUROSTUDENT core questionnaire or used a slightly different phrasing for the included sources (Austria, France, Germany, Italy, Norway, and Switzerland). Moreover, students in Austria were not asked directly to indicate their primary source of funding, but their primary source was determined based on the amounts of money they received from different sources.
- In Germany, the information on the organisation of enrolment periods abroad refers to the longest and not to the most recent enrolment abroad. However, this should not lead to severe incomparability, as only about 4 % of students in Germany studied abroad more than once (Middendorff et al., 2013, p. 166).
- Finally, the samples of some countries (Germany, Italy, Romania, and Slovenia) do not include international students. This has implications for the mobility rates and the aggregate perception of obstacles to mobility in these countries.

## Data and interpretation

### International student mobility rates by type of stay abroad

*More than 25 % of students in Austria, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, and Norway have been abroad during their studies*

How large are the shares of students gaining study-related experience abroad? Which types of international student mobility do they realise? And which differences between countries are there? Figure 10.1 provides answers to these questions.

The share of students in the cross-sectional EUROSTUDENT samples who have realised an enrolment, an internship, a language course, or another study-related experience abroad ranges between 5 % and 39 % (Figure 10.1a).


- More than one quarter of students have been abroad in the Nordic countries



Figure 10.1

## International student mobility rates by type of stay abroad

Share of students (in %)



**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, K.1, K.16. **No data:** Study-related experiences abroad (all types), internship, language course: CH.

**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 4.1 Have you ever been enrolled abroad as a student in higher education?, 4.10 Have you ever been abroad for other study-related activities as a student in higher education?

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** AT, CH, FI, FR.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

Denmark, Finland, and Norway as well as in the Czech Republic and Austria. Less than every 10<sup>th</sup> student has made a study-related experience in Georgia, Lithuania, Armenia, Ukraine, Slovakia, Romania, Bosnia-Herzegovina, and Russia.

Besides examining the share of students who have realised any type of a study-related experience, EUROSTUDENT data also allow the examination of rates of students having realised specific types of student mobility, such as periods of enrolment or internships abroad.

- Regarding enrolment periods abroad, the corresponding share amounts to more than 10% in Denmark, Finland, Norway, Estonia, Slovenia, and Sweden and to less than 5% in Poland, Serbia, Croatia, Hungary, Armenia, Ukraine, Slovakia, and Bosnia-Herzegovina (Figure 10.1b).



- The share of students having realised an internship is rather low in most countries, but it is at least 10 % in Denmark, Austria, and Estonia. Similarly, the share of students having realised a language course is rather low in most countries, but at least 8 % in Finland, Estonia, and Italy.

In the large majority of countries, foreign enrolment is thus the relatively most frequently realised study-related experience. For this reason and as it is the type of mobility most closely related to studies in higher education, the following analyses concentrate mainly on periods of enrolment abroad.

### Foreign enrolment rates and plans

*The potential to further increase the foreign enrolment rate seems to be particularly high in Armenia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, Georgia, Serbia, Slovakia, and Ukraine*

The share of students who have studied abroad temporarily can be analysed in conjunction with the share of students who have not yet studied abroad but plan to do so in the future. Firstly, this enables the estimation of the potential foreign enrolment rate, i.e. the foreign enrolment rate that would be measured after the graduation of all surveyed students, provided that they all realise their foreign enrolment plans. Of course, this potential foreign enrolment rate is unlikely to be reached because students face a number of obstacles that may deter them from studying abroad (Figure 10.4). Secondly, setting foreign enrolment plans in relation to foreign enrolment experience creates an impression of the extent to which a national student population's willingness to study abroad is currently exploited. This is, of course, also highly dependent on the average study progress of students in the national samples.

- Despite considerable shares of students still planning to study abroad temporarily, the potential foreign enrolment rate is lower than 50 % in all countries but Armenia, Georgia, and Montenegro (Table A10.1).
- The potential to further increase the foreign enrolment rate seems to be particularly high in Armenia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, Georgia, Serbia, Slovakia, and Ukraine. In these countries, the share of students still planning to study abroad is more than 10 times larger than the share of students who have already studied abroad. In Austria, Finland, Italy, Norway, Slovenia, and Sweden, the share of students still planning to study abroad is less than twice as high than the share of students who already studied abroad.

*Access to international student mobility is socially selective*

As previous research has shown (e.g. Salisbury et al., 2009; Orr et al., 2011; Wiers-Jenssen, 2011; Netz, 2013), access to international student mobility is socially selective. This pattern is clearly visible also in the EUROSTUDENT data, both regarding realised and planned periods of study abroad.


- In all countries but Armenia, Serbia, and Ukraine, the share of students who have studied abroad is higher among students with higher education background (Figure 10.2a) than among students without higher education background (Figure 10.2b).
- In addition, the share of students who have not yet studied abroad but plan to do so is higher among students with higher education background in all covered countries. The differences regarding planned foreign enrolments tend to be even larger than those regarding realised foreign enrolment periods.

The social selectivity of international student mobility is also visible regarding internships and language courses.

Figure 10.2

## Foreign enrolment rates and plans by educational background

Share of students (in %)



Data source: EUROSTUDENT V, K.2.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 4.1 Have you ever been enrolled abroad as a student in higher education?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions: AT, CH, FI, FR.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: DE, GE, IT.

- In all countries but Armenia and Norway, the share of students having realised an internship is at least slightly higher among students with higher education background than among those without higher education background (Table Aro.2).
- Moreover, the share of students having taken part in a language course abroad is at least slightly higher among students with higher education background in all countries but Armenia, Lithuania, Norway, and Serbia (Table Aro.2).

Differences in foreign enrolment rates and plans between male and female students are less pronounced than differences by students' educational background.

- In the majority of countries, the share of students who have studied abroad temporarily is very slightly higher among women than among men (Table Aro.1). In most of these countries, however, the share of students still planning to study abroad is

*Differences in mobility rates by sex tend to be small*

slightly lower among women. There are also countries in which the shares for both realised and planned foreign enrolment periods are higher among women (Croatia, Ireland, and Latvia) and countries in which this is the case among men (Sweden).

Regarding the realisation of internships abroad, no cross-country pattern is visible concerning sex differences. However, the share of students who followed a language course abroad is very slightly higher among female students in the striking majority of countries (Table A10.2). This arguably has to do with the strong overrepresentation of women in the humanities and arts (>Chapter 4), where comparatively many students of languages tend to complete a language course abroad.

**Foreign enrolment rates tend to be high among students of humanities and arts and low among teacher training students**

Foreign enrolment rates and plans differ markedly by field of study. Students of humanities and arts seem rather likely to gain foreign enrolment experience during their studies. In contrast, the foreign enrolment rates among students of engineering and in particular among students of teacher training and education science are comparatively low.

- In most countries, both the share of students having realised and the share of students still planning an enrolment abroad are higher among students of humanities and arts than among students of engineering and among students of teacher training and education science (Figure 10.3).
- The potential foreign enrolment rate of students of humanities and arts exceeds 40 % in a narrow majority of countries and 50 % in 10 countries. In contrast, the potential foreign enrolment rate is higher than 40 % among students of engineering only in seven countries and among students of teacher training and education science only in four countries.
- In the – albeit small – majority of countries, students of engineering have a slightly higher foreign enrolment rate than students of teacher training and education science. In the large majority of countries, the share of students still planning to study abroad is higher among students of engineering than among students of teacher training and education science.
- The foreign enrolment rate of students in teacher training and education science is comparatively high (more than 10 %) in Norway, Finland, France, Montenegro, and Malta. In Montenegro and Bosnia-Herzegovina, teacher training and education is the field in which students have the highest average foreign enrolment rate of all fields, even compared to fields not shown in Figure 10.3 (>DRM, subtopic K.4).<sup>4</sup>

### Obstacles to enrolment abroad

**The most critical obstacles to studying abroad are the additional financial burden and the separation from partner, children, and friends**


Which are the major obstacles deterring students from a temporary enrolment abroad? And how does the perception of obstacles differ between countries? Figure 10.4 provides answers to these questions. It presents shares of students with neither study abroad experience nor plans who assess certain aspects as (quite) big obstacles to studying abroad. Judging by unweighted cross-country averages of student shares considering aspects (quite) big obstacles, the most critical of the selected barriers are the associated additional financial burden (63 %) and the separation from partner, children, and friends (47 %). These are followed at a much lower level by insufficient foreign language skills (29 %), expected problems with the recognition of credits gained abroad, and a lack of information provided by the home institution (each 22 %).

<sup>4</sup> For a more detailed analysis of EUROSTUDENT V data on the foreign enrolment rates of students in teacher training and education science see Ballowitz et al. (2014).

Figure 10.3

## Foreign enrolment rates and plans by field of study

Share of students (in %)



**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, K.4. **No data:** Teacher training and education science: PL. **Too few cases:** Teacher training and education science: LV, RO; Teacher training and education science, students who have not been enrolled abroad but plan to enrol abroad: ME.

**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 4.1 Have you ever been enrolled abroad as a student in higher education?


**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** AT, CH, FI, FR.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

Figure 10.4

**Selected obstacles to enrolment abroad**

Share of students who have not been enrolled abroad and do not plan to enrol abroad considering selected issues as (quite) big obstacles (in %)



**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, K.15. **No data:** AT, IT, lack of information: DE.

**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 4.9 To what extent are or were the following aspects an obstacle to studying abroad for you?

**Notes:** Students assessed possible obstacles to studying abroad on a five-point scale ranging from "no obstacle" to "big obstacle". The figures show how large a share of students considered certain aspects to be either (4) "quite big" or (5) "big" obstacles. Data for NL stem from the 2014 and not from the 2013 national student survey.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** CH, DE, DK, FR, RU.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

- In all EUROSTUDENT countries but Latvia, Switzerland, the Czech Republic, Sweden, and Russia, at least 58 % of students without foreign enrolment experience consider an additional financial burden a (quite) big obstacle to studying abroad (Figure 10.4a).
- The separation from partner, children, and friends is considered a (quite) big obstacle to enrolment abroad by relatively large shares of students (at least 59 %) in Poland, Estonia, Malta, Finland, and Norway (Figure 10.4b). This share is comparatively low (32 % or less) in Georgia, Ukraine, Switzerland, and Russia. These findings reflect that students in the former countries tend to be older on average and more likely to already have children, while the average age and share of students with children tend to be rather low in the latter countries (>Chapter 4).
- The share of students regarding insufficient foreign language skills as a (quite) big obstacle to an enrolment abroad is relatively high (at least 49 %) in Ireland, Poland, Hungary, and Georgia and relatively low (less than 15 %) in Malta, Denmark, Switzerland, and Sweden (Figure 10.4c). With regard to this aspect, the degree of variation across countries, as measured by the standard deviation (not shown in Figure 10.4), is particularly high.
- Problems with the recognition of credits gained abroad are a (quite) big obstacle for relatively large shares of students (more than 30 %) in Croatia, Poland, Hungary, Slovenia, Germany, and Armenia and for rather low shares of students (15 % or less) in Denmark, the Netherlands, Norway, France, and Sweden (Figure 10.4d).
- A lack of information provided by the home institution is a (quite) big obstacle for comparatively large shares of students (at least 35 %) in Ireland, Croatia, Poland, Hungary, and Georgia and for relatively low shares of students (15 % or less) in Estonia, Norway, Latvia, Switzerland, the Czech Republic, Sweden, and Russia (Figure 10.4e).

Overall, Figure 10.4 illustrates that students tend to perceive the selected aspects as (quite) big obstacles to studying abroad relatively frequently in Ireland, Croatia, Poland, Hungary, and Armenia and relatively less frequently in Latvia, Switzerland, Sweden, and Russia.

### Organisation of enrolment periods abroad

As Figure 10.5 shows, there is a substantial degree of variation in how students organise foreign enrolment periods.

- The share of students who realised their enrolment period abroad through an EU programme amounts to at least 80 % in Lithuania, Slovenia, Poland, Romania, and the Czech Republic.
- In France, Denmark, Armenia, Montenegro, Georgia, Norway, and Russia, comparatively large shares of students (more than 30 %) organised their foreign enrolment using other (usually national) programmes.
- The share of students enrolling abroad temporarily without a programme is comparatively high (at least 40 %) in Italy, Malta, Sweden, Montenegro, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Russia, and Serbia.


Overall, EU programmes constitute the main route to studying abroad. In the majority of countries, they are used by more than half of the students who enrol abroad temporarily. Judging by unweighted averages across countries, an enrolment abroad outside

*EU programmes  
constitute the  
main route to  
study abroad*

Figure 10.5

**Organisation of (most recent) enrolment abroad**

Share of students who have been enrolled abroad (in %)



Data source: EUROSTUDENT V, K.9. Too few cases: UA.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 4.5 Within which of the following organisational frameworks was your study abroad organised?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions: DE, FR.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: DE, GE, IT.

of a mobility programme is the second most frequently chosen solution, followed by foreign enrolment through another programme.

The standard pathways to studying abroad differ slightly between Bachelor and Master students. In the majority of EUROSTUDENT countries for which the relevant data are available, the share of students who realised their enrolment abroad with an EU programme is higher among Master students than among Bachelor students (Table Aro.3). In contrast, the share of students having realised their enrolment abroad without a programme is higher among Bachelor students.

**Funding of enrolment abroad by educational background**

**Public sources and means from parents, family, or partner tend to be the primary sources of funding for enrolments abroad**

Figure 10.6 shows to which extent students who have studied abroad temporarily indicated the four categories described above (see Methodological and conceptual notes) as primary sources of funding for their enrolment periods abroad. Judging by un-weighted averages across countries, public sources (40%) and means from parents, family, or partner (36%) are the primary sources of funding for studying abroad, followed by income from jobs (14%), and other sources (10%). However, a more differentiated analysis shows that funding solutions vary strongly across countries.

■ In Russia, Ukraine, Armenia, and Georgia as well as in Switzerland and Italy, means from parents, family, or partner were the primary source of funding for more than half of all students who studied abroad. In contrast, the parents, family, or partner were the primary source for less than 25% of students with foreign enrolment experience in the Nordic countries Sweden, Denmark, Finland, and Norway, in the Baltic countries (Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania), as well as in Hungary, Slovenia, and the Czech Republic.



- Relatedly, the share of students whose primary source was a public one is relatively high (above 60 %) in Romania, Hungary, Slovenia, Latvia, the Czech Republic, Lithuania, and Norway and particularly low (15 % or lower) in Russia, Switzerland, and Croatia.
- With more than 20 %, the share of students whose primary source for their enrolment abroad was income from jobs is comparatively high in Switzerland, Ireland, the Netherlands, Denmark, and Finland.

Besides analysing students' primary source of funding, EUROSTUDENT data also illustrate from which sources students drew at least some money for financing their stay abroad. This perspective reveals that although familial support is not always the primary source of funding (Figure 10.6), it nevertheless seems to be quite important for financing periods of study abroad. In the large majority of countries, the share of students who utilised means from their parents, family, or partner to fund their enrolment abroad exceeds 60 % (Figure 10.7).


- This share is even higher than 80 % in Slovakia, Russia, Italy, the Czech Republic, and Switzerland. In contrast, it lies below 50 % in the Nordic countries Finland, Denmark, Sweden, and Norway. Students in the Nordic countries are arguably less dependent on familial support because they have access to relatively generous and internationally portable support schemes. They also tend to be older (>Chapter 4), therefore more likely to have an own income, and thus less dependent on relatives and partners (>Chapter 7).

*Although familial support is not always the primary source, many students receive at least some support from their relatives in most countries*

**Figure 10.6**

**Primary source of funding for (most recent) enrolment abroad**

Share of students who have been enrolled abroad (in %)



**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, K.10. **No data:** DE, RS. **Too few cases:** BA.

**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 4.6 Which of the following sources did you use to fund your study period abroad and which one of them was your primary source of funding?

**Notes:** The considered sources for funding an enrolment period abroad were aggregated as follows: parents/family/partner; income from job(s) (= income from previous job + income from job during studies abroad); public sources (= regular grants/loans from home country + special grants/loans from home country for going abroad + study grants/loans from host country + EU study grants), other (= funds from private businesses/NGOs + other source).

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** AT, CH, FR, IT, NO.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.



**Students with higher education background are more likely to receive familial support**

The extent to which students can rely on familial support is contingent on their educational background. In the large majority of countries, the share of students who utilised means from their parents, family, or partner for their enrolment abroad is higher among students with higher education background than among those without higher education background (Figure 10.7).

■ The percentage point difference between the two groups amounts to at least 20 points in Romania, France, and Ireland. In Russia, Croatia, Lithuania, Montenegro, Finland, and Sweden, there are no evident signs that students with higher education background are in a privileged position concerning familial support for studying abroad.

### Recognition of credits gained during enrolment abroad

**In most countries, more than 70 % of students who gained credits abroad had their credits fully or partly recognised**

In 19 out of 26 EUROSTUDENT countries, more than 70 % of students who gained credit during their enrolment abroad had their credits either fully or partly recognised upon return (Figure 10.8).

■ Full recognition is particularly common in Denmark, the Netherlands, and France. In these countries, 75 % of students who gained credit during their enrolment period abroad had their credits fully recognised in their home country. In Hungary, Ukraine, and Armenia, the corresponding share is lower than 35 %.


■ Partial recognition is rather common in Serbia, Croatia, Slovakia, and Hungary (more than 30 % of the considered students) and rather uncommon (less than 10 %) in Denmark, the Netherlands, France, Ireland, and Malta.

■ In Sweden, Croatia, Russia, Hungary, Ukraine, and Armenia, at least 15 % of students who earned credit during their enrolment abroad did not have their credits recognised. In some of these countries (Russia, Ukraine, and Armenia), there is additionally a share of more than 25 % of students indicating that they don't know yet

Figure 10.7

#### Students utilising funds from their parents, family or partner for their (most recent) enrolment abroad by educational background

Share of students who have been enrolled abroad (in %)



**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, K.10. **No data:** Without HE background: MT; with HE background: MT. **Too few cases:** UA; without HE background: BA, GE, HR, LT, LV, RU, SK; with HE background: RS.

**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 4.6 Which of the following sources did you use to fund your study period abroad and which one of them was your primary source of funding?


**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** AT.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

Figure 10.8

**Recognition of credits gained during (most recent) enrolment abroad**

Share of students who have been enrolled abroad (in %)

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, K.8. **No data:** AT, DE, NO.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 4.4 Were the credits (ECTS, certificates) you gained for your studies abroad recognised by your home institution?**Notes:** The question on credits gained during an enrolment abroad contained five items: "full recognition of credits", "partial recognition of credits", "no recognition of credits", "don't know (yet)", "no credits were gained abroad". For this figure, the category "no credits were gained abroad" was taken out and the remaining four were rescaled to 100%.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

whether their credits will be recognised. The insecurity of whether the credits for an enrolment abroad are recognised thus seems to be considerable in these countries.

**Foreign language proficiency by educational background**

The share of students with (very) good proficiency in at least two foreign languages varies massively across countries (Figure 10.9).

- It is at least 39 % in Malta, Slovenia, Serbia, Switzerland, and Armenia and lower than 15 % in Slovakia, Poland, Russia, and Ireland.

In the large majority of countries, the share of students indicating to have (very) good skills in at least two foreign languages is higher among students with higher education background than among those without higher education background.

- This gap is substantial (more than 10 percentage points) in the Czech Republic and Austria. In Malta, Bosnia-Herzegovina, and Norway, it is students without higher education background who have better self-assessed foreign language skills.

**Students with higher education background tend to have better self-assessed foreign language skills**

**Language of domestic study programme**

Figure 10.10 shows shares of students whose national study programme is (mainly) taught in a foreign language.<sup>5</sup>

- The share of students whose domestic study programme is mainly taught in a foreign language varies from more than 20 % in Denmark, Finland, and Sweden to less than 5 % in Malta, the Czech Republic, Serbia, Slovakia, Croatia, Slovenia, Ukraine, Georgia, Ireland, and Russia.


**In Denmark, Finland and Sweden, more than 20 % of students pursue a study programme in a foreign language**

<sup>5</sup> The fact that regional official languages were excluded besides national official languages has a notable influence on the shares presented in Figure 10.10 only in the case of Ukraine. In Eastern and Southern Ukraine, where Russian has the status of an official language, considerable shares of students follow programmes that are mainly taught in Russian.

Figure 10.9

**Self-assessed foreign language proficiency by educational background**

Share of students with (very) good proficiency in at least two foreign languages (in %)



Data source: EUROSTUDENT V, K.21. No data: UA.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 5.4 What are your written and spoken language skills?


Notes: The definition of foreign language skills does not comprise mother tongues that are official languages of the country of study. Proficiency in a country's official language is thus only counted as foreign language skills if this language is not the student's mother tongue.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: DE, GE, IT.

Figure 10.10

**Domestic study programmes in foreign languages**

Share of students whose domestic study programme is mainly taught in a foreign language (in %)



Data source: EUROSTUDENT V, K.22. No data: AT, CH, DE, IT. Too few cases: Master students: RU.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 1.10 What is the main teaching language of your study programme?

Notes: It is possible that the values for both Bachelor and Master students exceed the value for all students if only few students in national degree programmes (>Chapter 5) study in a foreign language (which is the case e.g. in FR). Vice versa, the value for both Bachelor and Master students can lie below that for all students (as e.g. in MT) if large shares of students in national degree programmes study in a foreign language.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions: IE.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: DE, GE, IT.

A more differentiated analysis (not shown in Figure 10.10) shows that the large majority of students studying in a foreign language is following their classes in English.

- Notable exceptions to this pattern are Armenia, Estonia, and Georgia (where Russian is a rather frequent foreign language of study programmes), and Slovakia (where a large share of study programmes in foreign language is offered in Hungarian).

In most countries, the share of students whose domestic study programme is mainly taught in a foreign language is higher among Master students than among Bachelor students (Figure 10.10).

- This difference amounts to at least 20 percentage points in Denmark, Sweden, Norway, and the Netherlands.

## Discussion and policy considerations

The analysis has shown that students' tendency to go abroad for the purpose of study-related experiences varies substantially across countries. The share of students who have realised an enrolment, an internship, a language course, or another study-related experience abroad ranges between 5 % and 39 % in the EUROSTUDENT countries.<sup>6</sup> This may raise the question of whether it is reasonable for different countries in the EHEA to have very similar benchmarks regarding international mobility rates. Besides foreign enrolment rates, the shares of students still planning to go abroad during studies were analysed. Judging by the size of these shares, the potential to further increase the foreign enrolment rate seems to be particularly high in Armenia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, Georgia, Serbia, Slovakia, and Ukraine.

The analysis has also confirmed the results of previous research in that access to international student mobility is highly selective. To begin with, international mobility is contingent on students' social background: In all besides a few countries (Armenia, Serbia, and Ukraine), the share of students who have studied abroad temporarily is higher among students with higher education background than among students without higher education background. Additionally, the shares of students having realised an internship or a language course are mostly higher among students with higher education background. This can be considered problematic against the background that international mobility during studies seems to positively influence students' personality development and employment prospects (Messer & Wolter, 2007; Wiers-Jenssen, 2011; Netz, 2012; Rodrigues, 2013; Zimmermann & Neyer, 2013). At present, the opportunity of reaping the benefits of international mobility is thus apparently unequally distributed across social groups. This finding reinforces the importance of compensatory measures such as those announced in the EHEA Mobility Strategy (2012).<sup>7</sup>

Foreign enrolment rates also differ by field of study. It can be argued that (at least moderate) differences between fields of study are unproblematic, as the intrinsic motivation

<sup>6</sup> As explained above (see Methodological and conceptual notes), student surveys such as EUROSTUDENT tend to underestimate mobility rates if compared to the rates that would be measured for the same student cohorts by later graduate surveys. Student surveys can, however, provide a general picture of differences in mobility rates between countries and groups of students.

<sup>7</sup> Differences in mobility propensities by sex have turned out to be small. The foreign enrolment rate is very slightly higher among women in most countries and – arguably related to their field of study choice – they seem to be more likely to realise language courses abroad.

of students and the need to gain international experience for the later career differ by fields of study. For students of languages, for instance, it may be considered more important to experience a stay abroad than for students of mathematics. A disputable case, however, is that of teacher training students. Confirming the results of previous studies (Zgaga, 2008, p. 37; Netz, 2013), the analysis has shown that students of teacher training and education science are, in many countries, quite unlikely to study abroad temporarily. However, it can be considered crucial that future teachers gain mobility experience. First-hand international experience should prepare future teachers to handle culturally diverse classrooms and help them to understand the international phenomena they will have to explain to their pupils. Teacher training students are also in a multiplier position, as they can positively influence the attitude of pupils towards future international experiences.

To date, the further expansion of international mobility rates is hampered by a number of obstacles to mobility. In this respect, a cross-country pattern has become apparent: The most critical of the analysed obstacles to studying abroad is the (perceived) additional financial burden. Other than attitudinal or motivational obstacles, which need to be tackled early on in students' educational history and which are hard to eliminate once students have entered higher education, financial obstacles would seem to qualify as solvable problems given the commitment of national government and supranational entities. Not only an enhancement of funding schemes and amounts but also better information on these funding opportunities seem to be needed. A separation from partner, children, and friends has turned out to be the second most critical obstacle, particularly in countries where student populations are comparatively old and therefore more likely to have children and to be reliant on own income.<sup>8</sup> Obstacles that the analyses have revealed to be less critical are insufficient foreign language skills, expected problems with the recognition of credits gained abroad and a lack of information provided by the home institution.

Of course, the analysis of cross-country patterns ignores a variety of country particularities regarding the perception of obstacles to studying abroad. Besides individual obstacles that are particularly crucial in specific countries (e.g. insufficient language skills in Hungary or problems with the recognition of credits gained abroad in Croatia), the overall perception of obstacles to a period of enrolment abroad differs across countries. The shares of students perceiving the examined aspects as (quite) big obstacles to an enrolment period abroad turned out to be generally comparatively high in Armenia, Croatia, Hungary, Ireland, and Poland and relatively low in Latvia, Russia, Sweden, and Switzerland.

A large degree of variation across countries can also be observed regarding the organisation, funding and recognition of foreign enrolment periods. Concerning the organisation of foreign enrolments, EU programmes have been shown to be the most frequently chosen solution. In the majority of countries, EU programmes are used by

<sup>8</sup> A notable finding of EUROSTUDENT IV was that in the Nordic countries, the separation from family, partner and friends instead of financial strain was the single most critical obstacle to studying abroad (Orr et al., 2011, p. 175). This still holds true for Norway and Sweden, although on a less pronounced level, in this round of EUROSTUDENT (Figures 10.4a and 10.4b). In Denmark and Finland, the additional financial burden associated with an enrolment abroad now turns out to be slightly more critical than social concerns. The blurring of this pattern is related to the inclusion of international students in the sample, who already tend to live away from their domestic social networks.

more than half of the students who enrol abroad temporarily. Enrolment abroad without a mobility programme tends to be the second most frequently chosen solution.

Accordingly, public sources and means from parents, family or partner have turned out to be the primary sources of funding for enrolment periods abroad. Although familial support is not always the primary source of funding, large shares of students receive at least some familial support in most countries. In this respect, a probable source of the social selectivity of international mobility has been observed, namely that students with higher education background are more likely to receive familial support than students without higher education background. A further expansion of socially compensatory mobility schemes may thus be needed in many countries.

The recognition of the credits gained during a period of study abroad seems to be common in most EUROSTUDENT countries. In 19 out of 26 examined countries, more than 70 % of students who gained credit during an enrolment abroad had their credits either fully or partly recognised upon return. However, there are also countries with comparatively large potential to improve recognition procedures. In Armenia, Russia, and Ukraine, for instance, comparatively large shares of students did not have their credits recognised (yet). It should, however, be kept in mind that recognition may depend on the destination countries of students. One would expect that national student populations who are primarily realising their stays abroad within the EHEA should be more likely to have their credits gained abroad recognised.

Students' levels of foreign language proficiency – an important prerequisite and a desired outcome of international mobility – are unequally distributed across the EUROSTUDENT countries. The share of students with (very) good proficiency in at least two foreign languages varies massively, from at least 39 % in Armenia, Malta, Serbia, Slovenia, and Switzerland to less than 15 % in Ireland, Poland, Russia, and Slovakia. Students with higher education background turned out to have better self-assessed foreign language skills than their peers without higher education background.

Finally, this chapter has examined the extent to which students' national study programmes are taught in foreign languages in order to approximate the extent of internationalisation at home. The share of students whose domestic study programme is taught in a foreign language (usually English) ranges from more than 20 % in Denmark, Finland and Sweden to less than 5 % in Croatia, the Czech Republic, Georgia, Ireland, Malta, Russia, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, and Ukraine. In the Nordic countries and the Netherlands, this share is even quite substantially higher among Master students than among Bachelor students. Generally, the countries in which this share is high/low are also those in which the international mobility rate of students tends to be high/low. It thus seems that a high credit mobility propensity of a national student population is also reflected in a high degree of internationalisation at home. This can be read as support for the argument that internationalisation at home may not only be an alternative to physical mobility, but also a preparation for later physical mobility, as it may attract students from abroad and thereby allow national students to learn in culturally diverse settings right from the start of their studies.

# Tables

Table A10.1

## Foreign enrolment rates and plans by sex

Share of students (in %)

Country	Female		Male		Total	
	Students who have been enrolled abroad	Students who have not been enrolled abroad but plan to enrol abroad	Students who have been enrolled abroad	Students who have not been enrolled abroad but plan to enrol abroad	Students who have been enrolled abroad	Students who have not been enrolled abroad but plan to enrol abroad
AM	3	58	7	52	4	56
AT	11	10	9	11	10	10
BA	2	41	3	40	3	40
CH	6	21	6	21	6	21
CZ	6	25	5	29	6	26
DE	10	16	7	17	8	16
DK	14	25	11	26	12	26
EE	12	35	10	40	11	37
FI	19	20	16	22	18	21
FR	8	37	7	39	8	38
GE	5	57	5	55	5	56
HR	3	37	1	35	2	36
HU	4	31	4	32	4	31
IE	7	21	6	19	7	20
IT	11	13	9	14	10	13
LT	7	23	5	31	6	26
LV	6	13	3	12	5	12
ME	6	50	8	41	7	46
MT	10	40	7	39	9	40
NL	8	19	7	21	7	20
NO	18	16	13	16	16	16
PL	4	25	4	24	4	24
RO	8	33	7	39	7	35
RS	1	36	2	36	2	36
RU	4	30	6	27	5	29
SE	13	17	14	21	13	19
SI	12	17	12	20	12	18
SK	2	23	2	24	2	23
UA	1	30	2	29	2	29

Data source: EUROSTUDENT V, K.1, K.2.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 4.1 Have you ever been enrolled abroad as a student in higher education?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions: AT, CH, FI, FR.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: DE, GE, IT.

Table A10.2

**Participation in internships and language courses by educational background and sex**

Share of students (in %)

Country	Internship/work placement				Language course			
	Without HE background	With HE background	Female	Male	Without HE background	With HE background	Female	Male
AM	7	6	3	7	8	7	6	6
AT	11	21	15	13	4	6	5	4
BA	2	3	2	3	2	4	2	3
CH	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
CZ	6	7	7	6	4	8	7	5
DE	5	8	8	5	1	2	2	1
DK	8	10	9	10	4	5	6	3
EE	8	11	9	12	7	9	9	7
FI	8	9	9	7	9	14	16	7
FR	6	9	7	8	3	7	5	6
GE	0	1	1	1	2	2	2	2
HR	1	3	2	2	1	3	2	1
HU	4	5	4	6	3	6	5	5
IE	4	7	5	5	2	5	4	3
IT	2	3	3	2	6	12	9	7
LT	4	6	5	5	1	1	1	0
LV	4	4	5	3	1	2	2	1
ME	4	8	4	7	4	7	6	5
MT	2	3	2	2	1	1	1	0
NL	7	8	7	7	1	3	2	2
NO	2	2	3	1	1	1	1	1
PL	4	5	4	7	3	4	3	4
RO	3	4	4	4	0	1	0	1
RS	2	3	2	3	2	2	2	2
RU	1	4	3	4	2	4	4	3
SE	3	5	5	3	3	6	5	4
SI	5	6	5	5	4	9	7	6
SK	2	4	3	3	1	4	3	2
UA	1	2	2	1	1	2	2	1

– no data

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, K.17.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 4.10 Have you ever been abroad for other study-related activities as a student in higher education?**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** AT, FI, FR, IT.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.



Table A10.3

**Organisation of enrolment periods abroad by type of study programme**

Share of students who have been enrolled abroad (in %)

Country	EU programme (e.g. ERASMUS)		Other programme (e.g. national programme)		No programme	
	Bachelor	Master	Bachelor	Master	Bachelor	Master
AM	29	•	37	•	34	•
AT	63	63	24	26	13	11
BA	19	•	17	•	64	•
CH	60	56	23	28	17	16
CZ	82	79	6	5	12	16
DE	56	58	26	23	18	19
DK	32	35	31	34	37	31
EE	62	70	9	18	29	12
FI	63	45	23	37	14	18
FR	48	56	34	32	18	12
GE	22	12	42	61	36	27
HR	•	•	•	•	•	•
HU	69	81	13	13	18	6
IE	54	42	14	11	32	47
IT	49	63	1	3	50	34
LT	93	100	7	0	0	0
LV	64	87	4	2	32	11
ME	17	28	38	38	45	34
MT	–	–	–	–	–	–
NL	46	45	14	18	40	37
NO	14	20	53	47	33	33
PL	91	78	2	11	7	11
RO	75	84	15	11	10	5
RS	14	•	16	•	70	•
RU	15	•	37	•	48	•
SE	20	32	17	17	63	51
SI	93	87	4	9	3	4
SK	•	•	•	•	•	•
UA	•	•	•	•	•	•

– no data • too few cases

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, K.9.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 4.5 Within which of the following organisational frameworks was your study abroad organised?**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** DE, FR.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

## Chapter 11

# Students' assessment of their studies and future plans

### Key findings

- **Students' satisfaction with their study programme:** In the majority of the EURO-STUDENT countries, students are quite satisfied with their current study programmes. Satisfaction levels are especially high regarding the quality of teaching and study facilities. They are somewhat lower concerning the organisation of studies and the timetable as well as the administration's attitude towards students. Students at non-university institutions tend to be slightly more satisfied than students at universities.
- **Students' assessment of their chances on the labour market:** In the majority of countries, students are more confident about their employment prospects on the national labour market than about those on the international labour market. There are countries in which students are relatively optimistic (e.g. Denmark, Ireland, Finland and Malta) and countries in which they are comparatively pessimistic (e.g. Bosnia-Herzegovina, Montenegro, Romania and Slovakia) about their chances on both the national and the international labour market. The assessment of employment prospects varies substantially by field of study: Students of humanities and arts are rather pessimistic about their chances on the national labour market. In contrast, students of engineering, natural sciences as well as health and welfare are comparatively optimistic in most countries. The assessment of students of teacher training and education science seems to be strongly dependent on the national context.
- **Students' plans for further studies:** The share of students planning to continue studying after graduating from the current programme varies from 35 % in Sweden to 75 % in Ukraine. Students who plan to continue studying usually intend to do so within the first year after graduation. In Bosnia-Herzegovina, Estonia, Ireland, Finland, Lithuania, Malta, Montenegro, Norway and Sweden, larger shares of students plan to follow flexible learning paths, i.e. to return to higher education after an interruption of more than one year. Educational aspirations vary by students' educational background: In all covered countries, the share of students having plans for further studies is higher among students with higher education background than among students without higher education background. Moreover, the former group seems to be more strongly oriented towards a transition to further studies without longer interruptions.
- **Bachelor students planning to complete a Master abroad:** The share of Bachelor students planning to complete their Master abroad varies from more than 20 % in Armenia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Georgia, Malta, Montenegro and Serbia to below 5 % in the Czech Republic and Ireland. Regarding the intention for international degree mobility, social selectivity is apparent: In most countries, the share of Bachelor students planning to complete their Master abroad is higher among Bachelor students with higher education background than among those without higher education background.

## Main issues

Higher education is considered a process that allows students to develop their personality and, thereby, to become active and socially included citizens. Moreover, it is increasingly seen as a means to prepare students for the labour market and to raise their employability in the long-term (Bucharest Communiqué, 2012). Whether these goals can be attained depends, among other things, on the quality of the study programme pursued.

Against this background, Chapter 11 presents an assessment of students' previous experiences in higher education in conjunction with an analysis of their plans for future studies.

### Quality of higher education

The quality of higher education assumes a paramount role in the debate about the implementation of the European Higher Education Area (e.g. Bucharest Communiqué, 2012). This results from developments that have led to concerns about the quality of higher education in Europe. Firstly, massification of higher education and the ensuing widened participation of diverse student groups have placed a renewed focus on teaching styles (Wolter, 2004, p. 84). Secondly, the focus on internationalising higher education and on introducing the Bologna study architecture has not always been followed by equivalent attention paid to ensuring the quality of education (van Damme, 2001). For instance, the Bologna degree structure has been criticised in some countries as being too inflexible for students to develop their interests and personality and for becoming internationally mobile (Wuttig et al., 2011, p. 14). Thirdly, New Public Management has found its way into European higher education and has led to a shift from pure academic self-governance towards stronger managerialism (de Boer et al., 2007). Nowadays, not only teaching staff, but also an institution's administrative staff are responsible for the provision of high-quality education by taking care of centralised tasks such as student and career services, quality assurance of teaching and research, public relations and faculty management (Krücken & Meier, 2006). Fourthly, both the massification of higher education and the financial crisis have put pressure on institutional budgets. This raises the question of whether institutional facilities still provide a basis solid enough for offering good education.

This chapter probes how students in the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) currently assess the four briefly discussed aspects: quality of teaching, organisation of studies and the timetable, attitude of administration towards students and study facilities.

### Employability of higher education graduates

Traditionally, the main goal of higher education was to support individuals' personality development and cultivation (Wolter, 2004, pp. 75–76), with career success largely being an implicit expectation. Since the 2000 release of the Lisbon Strategy at the latest, assuring students' employability constitutes an equally important and explicit function of higher education. Employability can be defined as 'a set of achievements – skills, understandings and personal attributes – that makes graduates more likely to gain employment and be successful in their chosen occupations, which benefits themselves, the workforce, the community and the economy' (Yorke, 2006, p. 8).

In reference to the employability debate, this chapter examines how students assess their future chances on the labour market. As the employability debate has from the start not been restricted to individual countries but geared towards a strengthening of the European labour market, chances on both the national and the international labour market are investigated.

### **Lifelong learning on flexible learning paths**

In many higher education systems, study programmes were, in the past, understood as foundations that shape opportunities during the course of an entire life, but which are laid once and for all during early adulthood. With the Bologna Process, this understanding has given way to a more dynamic comprehension: According to the paradigm of lifelong learning, students pass through various levels of education on flexible learning paths. They are supposed to leave and re-enter the education system depending on personal preferences, social obligations and professionally induced needs for further qualification.

In this context, this chapter depicts country differences regarding students' plans for continuing their studies and regarding the time frame during which they plan the transition to further studies (i.e. on completion of their current programme or after a longer break).

### **Educational aspirations in hierarchical education systems**

Characteristics of students such as their social background and gender are related to their proverbial climb on the educational ladder. Research on educational aspirations has highlighted that students without higher education background are less likely to move up to the highest levels of education (e.g. Hillmert & Jacob, 2010; Triventi, 2013). However, there is evidence of decreasing social background effects over the past decades (Breen et al., 2010). Furthermore, women were traditionally less likely to access higher educational levels, but this gender effect has declined or even been reversed in many education systems during the past decades (Buchmann & DiPrete, 2006; Breen et al., 2010; >Chapter 4).

In connection to this debate, this chapter shows how students' plans for continuing their studies vary by students' educational background and sex.

### **Plans for international degree mobility**

Educational aspirations not only concern the decision whether and what but also where to continue studying. In this respect, an eminent goal of the Bologna reforms was to harmonise national qualification frameworks and degree structures so as to allow students to spend (part of) their studies in other EHEA countries.

While students' participation in and plans for phases of temporary international (credit) mobility are analysed in >Chapter 10<sup>1</sup>, Chapter 11 briefly discusses plans for international degree mobility. More precisely, it looks at the extent to which Bachelor students with the intention to complete a Master programme plan to continue their studies abroad. As with plans for further studies in general, differences by students' educational background and sex are considered.

<sup>1</sup> >Chapter 10 also contains definitions of different types of international student mobility.

## Methodological and conceptual notes

### Quality of higher education

The quality of higher education is examined by analysing student satisfaction. Students rated their satisfaction with various aspects of the quality of their current study programme on a five-point scale ranging from “very satisfied” to “very dissatisfied” or “very well” to “not at all”. The two categories “very satisfied” and “satisfied” or “very well” and “well”, respectively, were aggregated for the analyses. This chapter focuses on the items “quality of teaching”, “organisation of studies and the timetable”, “the administration’s attitude towards students” and “study facilities”.

### Students’ assessment of their chances on the labour market

Students assessed their chances on the national and international labour markets on a five-point scale ranging from “very good” to “very poor”. Moreover, they could indicate that they were “unable to rate” their chances on the labour market. Their answers were aggregated to four categories: (1) very good + good, (2) fair, (3) poor + very poor, (4) unable to rate. In the analyses, the focus lies on the share of students who assess their chances on the labour market as (very) good.

### Students’ plans for further studies

Students answered the question on whether they had plans for further studies by choosing from four items: “yes, within a year after graduating from the current programme”, “yes, but not within a year after graduating from the current programme”, “I don’t know yet” and “no”.

### Plans for international degree mobility

In order to capture students’ plans for international degree mobility, Bachelor students who were intending to enrol in a Master programme were asked whether they were planning to choose a Master programme abroad or at home, i.e. in their current country of study. They could also indicate that they were still undecided whether to continue their studies abroad or at home.

### Strengths and shortcomings of EUROSTUDENT data

One way to determine the quality of higher education and the extent to which it creates employability would be to examine the later life courses of national higher education graduates. EUROSTUDENT, however, as a cross-sectional student survey, lets current students assess the quality of their study programmes and their chances on the labour market.<sup>2</sup> The EUROSTUDENT data therefore offer unique insights into the quality of higher education in the EHEA. The results produced by this approach will not necessarily match the findings of graduate studies. For instance, unforeseen economic downturns may hamper eventual employment prospects although students are currently convinced of the high value of their study programme. However, student survey data enable researchers to spot dysfunctional elements of higher education systems with a much shorter time lag than graduate survey data. They may thus function as early alert systems for problems that later graduates might face. Thereby, they constitute a

<sup>2</sup> Another important perspective on graduates’ employability, which is not dealt with here, is that of employers (for details see e.g. Humburg et al., 2013).

valuable complement to administrative statistics focussed on measuring educational success based on the formal completion of study programmes.

EUROSTUDENT data provide information on students' plans for continuing the studies and the time frame during which they plan the transition to further studies. It should be noted that these data are not readily comparable to administrative statistics, because the EUROSTUDENT surveys ask students in different semesters about their plans for further studies. These plans may still change during the further course of studies and once they have entered the labour market.

### Notes on national surveys

Due to slight deviations from the EUROSTUDENT survey conventions, there are some cases in which data of individual countries are of limited comparability.

- Some countries used slightly different items to capture students' satisfaction with their current study programme (Bosnia-Herzegovina and Finland) or constructed indices from a differentiated list of items to reflect the covered aspects of quality of higher education (Austria).
- In capturing students' assessment of their chances on the labour market, some countries used slightly different labels for their scales (Malta and Russia) or did not offer the item "unable to rate" (France).
- Regarding students' plans to continue their studies, Austria and Italy did not differentiate between a planned continuation within one year and a planned continuation later than a year after graduation from the current programme. In Finland and France, education systems have systemic features that might have led students to not understand a Master following a Bachelor degree as further studies.

## Data and interpretation

### Students' satisfaction with their current study programme

Overall, students are quite satisfied with the aspects of quality discussed in this chapter. Satisfaction levels are especially high regarding the quality of teaching and regarding study facilities (Figure 11.1). The unweighted averages across EUROSTUDENT countries of students who are (very) satisfied with these two aspects amount to 65 % and 64 %, respectively (not shown in Figure 11.1). The administration's attitude towards students (59 %) and students' satisfaction with the organisation of their studies and their timetable (55 %) register at slightly lower levels.


*Satisfaction levels are especially high regarding the quality of teaching and study facilities*

- In all countries but Montenegro, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, Austria, and Romania, at least 60 % of students are (very) satisfied with the quality of teaching in their study programme (Figure 11.1a).
- In all countries but France, Denmark, Poland, Montenegro, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, Austria, and Romania, at least 50 % of students are (very) satisfied with the organisation of their studies and their timetable (Figure 11.1b).
- Satisfaction levels are generally relatively high regarding all four covered aspects of quality in Estonia, Ireland, the Czech Republic, Armenia and Finland, while they are generally comparatively low in Montenegro, Croatia, Austria, Bosnia-Herzegovina, and Romania.

Figure 11.1

**Students' satisfaction with their current study programme**

Share of students who are (very) satisfied with a certain aspect (in %)



**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, J.1. **No data:** CH, DE, IT; attitude of administration towards students: AT, FR; study facilities: FR.

**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 1.11 How satisfied are you with your studies concerning the following points?

**Notes:** Students rated their satisfaction with their current study programme on a five-point scale ranging from "very satisfied" to "very dissatisfied" or "very well" to "not at all". For this figure, the categories "very satisfied" and "satisfied" / "very well" and "well" were aggregated.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** AT, BA, FI.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

Satisfaction levels tend to be slightly higher at non-university institutions than at universities. In the majority of countries for which data on both categories are available, the shares of students who are (very) satisfied with the organisation of their studies and their timetable, with the administration's attitude towards students, and especially with the quality of teaching are higher at non-university institutions (Table A11.1).



## Students' assessment of their chances on the labour market

Students assessed their chances on the labour market on a five-point scale ranging from “very good” to “very poor”. Moreover, they could indicate that they were “unable to rate” their chances on the labour market. In all countries, the latter was indicated by larger shares of students with regard to the international than with regard to the national labour market (Table A11.2), which may reflect that students have better knowledge about their respective national labour market than about foreign economies.

*Students are relatively optimistic about their chances on both the national and the international labour market in Denmark, Ireland, Finland and Malta*

In the majority of EUROSTUDENT countries, students are more confident about their employment prospects on the national labour market than about their employment prospects on the international labour market. This holds true for all countries lying below the diagonal line in Figure 11.2. In these countries, the shares of students assessing their chances on the labour market as (very) good are higher regarding the national than regarding the international labour market.


Beyond this general trend, Figure 11.2 highlights that there are country clusters concerning students self-assessed labour market prospects.

- On the one hand, there are countries in which students are relatively optimistic about their chances on both the national and the international labour market. This applies especially to Ireland, Malta, Denmark, and Finland.
- On the other hand, there are countries in which students are comparatively pessimistic about their chances on both the national and the international labour market. This holds true especially for Romania, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Montenegro, and Slovakia.

Figure 11.2

### Students' assessment of their chances on the (national vs. international) labour market

Share of students assessing their chances on the labour market as (very) good (in %)



Data source: EUROSTUDENT V, J.4. No data: AT, CH, DE, IT.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 1.12 How do you rate your chances on the labour market after graduating from your current study programme?

Notes: Students assessed their chances on the labour market on a five-point scale ranging from “very good” to “very poor”. Moreover, they could indicate that they were “unable to rate” their chances on the labour market. For this figure, the categories “very good” and “good” were aggregated.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions: FR, MT, RU.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: DE, GE, IT.



An alternative perspective is to examine the share of students assessing their chances on the labour market as (very) poor (Table A11.2).

- More than a third of students assess their chances as (very) poor in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, Montenegro, Romania, Serbia, and Slovenia in relation to the national labour market and in Romania concerning the international labour market.
- In contrast, this share is lower than 10 % for the national labour market in Estonia, Norway, Russia, and Sweden, and, for the international labour market, in Ireland.
- Slight differences in the assessment of labour market prospects are discernible by students' study programme and type of higher education institution (Table A11.3). Firstly, Master students tend to be more optimistic about their chances on the national labour market than Bachelor students, i.e. relatively more Master students expect to have (very) good chances on the national labour market in the majority of countries. Secondly, university students tend to be more optimistic about their chances on the international labour market. This may be related to the fields of study being offered at universities and to the orientation of graduates from these fields towards the international labour market.

### Bachelor students' assessment of their chances on the labour market by field of study

Students' assessment of their chances on the labour market varies substantially depending on their field of study. In order to compare self-assessed labour market prospects across fields of study, Figure 11.3 shows the percentage point differences between the shares of students in selected fields and the share of all students who assess their chances on the labour market as (very) good. A value above zero (dark grey bar in Figure 11.3b) indicates that students in a specific field tend to be more optimistic about their employment prospects than all students, while a value below zero (light grey bar in Figure 11.3b) reflects a more pessimistic view. Figure 11.3 refers to chances of Bachelor students on the national labour market.

#### *Students of humanities and arts are relatively pessimistic about their chances on the labour market*

In all countries besides Montenegro, students of humanities and arts are more pessimistic about their chances on the national labour market than all students (Figure 11.3b).

- The difference to all students is particularly large (more than 25 percentage points) in Norway, the Netherlands, Sweden, and Malta.

In contrast, engineering students tend to be more optimistic about their prospects on the national labour market than all students. This is the case in all countries but Armenia, Finland, Malta, and Latvia.

- The difference to all students is especially large (more than 15 percentage points) in the Netherlands, Hungary, Slovenia, and Montenegro.


Students of natural sciences are also comparatively optimistic about their chances on the national labour market.

- They are more optimistic than all students in all countries apart from Norway, Armenia, Russia and Romania. The difference to all students is particularly large (more than 15 percentage points) in Lithuania and Slovakia.

Students of health and welfare are more optimistic about their prospects on the national labour market than all students in the majority of countries.

Figure 11.3

## Bachelor students' assessment of their chances on the national labour market by field of study



**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, J.7. **No data:** AT, CH, DE, IT; teacher training and education science: PL. **Too few cases:** Teacher training and education science: LV, ME, RO; health and welfare: GE, NO.

**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 1.12 How do you rate your chances on the labour market after graduating from your current study programme?

**Notes:** Students assessed their chances on the labour market on a five-point scale ranging from "very good" to "very poor". Moreover, they could indicate that they were "unable to rate" their chances on the labour market. For this table, the categories "very good" and "good" were aggregated.

**Interpretation:** In NO, the share of Bachelor students assessing their chances on the national labour market as (very) good is 39 percentage points lower among students of humanities and arts than among all Bachelor students.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** FR, MT, RU.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

- In Finland, Sweden, Malta, Russia, France, and Romania, this difference to all students is large (more than 20 percentage points).
- However, there are also several countries in which students of health and welfare are more pessimistic about their labour market prospects (among those Hungary, Croatia and Slovakia).

The cross-country pattern regarding students of teacher training and education science is less evident. In this respect, the EUROSTUDENT countries are more polarised.

- Countries in which teacher training students are especially optimistic about their chances on the national labour market include Finland, Malta, and Estonia (positive difference to all students of more than 15 percentage points).
- Denmark, Lithuania, and Serbia are countries in which teacher training students are comparatively pessimistic (negative difference to all students of more than 10 percentage points).

Notwithstanding several country particularities, the differences between fields of study tend to be even more pronounced regarding employment prospects on the international labour market. In most countries, students of humanities and arts are comparatively pessimistic, whereas students of engineering, natural sciences as well as health and welfare are comparatively optimistic about their chances on the international labour market (Table A11.4). The assessment of the chances on the international labour market of students of teacher training and education science deviates markedly from their assessment of prospects on the national labour market. In all countries but Russia, Ukraine, and Georgia, they are quite pessimistic about their chances on the international labour market. This reflects the fact that teacher training is usually strongly oriented towards the national labour market.

### Students' plans for continuation of studies

Figure 11.4 shows the shares of students indicating that they wanted to continue studying after their current programme either within the first year after graduation or at a later stage in their life.

Overall, the share of students planning to continue their studies after graduating from their current programme varies substantially across countries, from 75 % in Ukraine to 35 % in Sweden (Figure 11.4a). This may be a result of differences in educational aspirations across countries or in the perceived value of certain qualifications on the labour market (e.g. Bachelor vs. Master), but also related to the average study progress of students in the national samples.

## 11


*Students who plan to continue studying usually intend to do so within the first year after graduation from the current programme*

In all countries for which a differentiation is possible, most students who plan to continue studying intend to do so within the first year after graduation from their current programme.

- The intention for such a direct transition is particularly high (more than 80 % of all students planning to continue studying) in Ukraine, Romania, the Czech Republic, Armenia, Hungary, Slovakia, Slovenia, and Russia.
- In contrast, larger shares of students plan to follow flexible learning paths in Malta, Montenegro, Ireland, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Estonia, Norway, Lithuania, Finland,

Figure 11.4

## Students' plans for continuation of studies by educational background



Data source: EUROSTUDENT V, J.8, J.9. No data: DE, FR; yes, but not within a year after graduation from current programme: AT, IT.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 1.6 Are you planning to continue studying after finishing your current study programme(s)?

Interpretation: In AM, the share of students planning to continue their studies within a year after graduating from current programme is 15 percentage points higher among students with HE background than among students without HE background.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions: AT, FI, IT.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: DE, GE, IT.

and Sweden. In these countries, the share of students intending to pursue further studies later than one year after graduation from their current programme is relatively high (more than 30% of all students planning to continue studying).

*In all covered countries, the share of students having plans for further studies is higher among students with higher education background*

As discussed above (see Main issues), previous research suggests that educational aspirations vary by students' educational background. This pattern is also visible in the EUROSTUDENT data. In all covered countries, the share of students planning to continue their studies after graduation from the current programme is higher among students with higher education background than among students without higher education background (Figure 11.4b).

■ This difference amounts to more than 10 percentage points in Armenia and the Netherlands and to less than two percentage points in Georgia, Montenegro, Serbia, Latvia, Norway, and Sweden.

The difference in educational aspirations between students with and without higher education background is especially visible concerning plans to continue studying within a year after graduating from current programme. Students with higher education background seem to be more strongly oriented towards a higher education trajectory without longer interruptions. The difference between the two educational background groups is less pronounced regarding students' plans to continue their studies after more than a year.

Between men and women, no such clear differences as between the educational background groups are apparent. The share of students intending to pursue further studies is slightly higher among women than among men in the majority of countries. This applies especially to women stating to plan further studies at more than one year after completing the current programme. Furthermore, the share of students negating to plan further studies is slightly lower among women in the majority of countries (Table A11.5).

### Bachelor students' plans for continuation of studies abroad

*In most countries, the share of Bachelor students planning to complete their Master abroad is higher among Bachelor students with higher education background*

Where do Bachelor students intending to enrol in a Master programme plan to continue their studies? Are they planning to stay in their current country of study or to complete their Master abroad? As Figure 11.5 shows, the answer to this question depends on the country and student group under observation.

■ The share of Bachelor students planning to complete their Master abroad varies substantially across countries. It ranges from more than 20 % in Montenegro, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Georgia, Armenia, Serbia, and Malta to less than 5 % in the Czech Republic and Ireland (Figure 11.5a).


■ If the share of Bachelor students who are undecided where to complete their Master is considered additionally, it becomes apparent that more than half of the Bachelor students with intention to complete a Master do not exclude the possibility of going abroad for their Master in Montenegro, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Georgia, Armenia, and Malta.

■ In the Czech Republic and Ireland, in contrast, this share lies below 20 %, meaning that more than 80 % of students with plans to complete a Master are determined to continue studying in the national higher education system.

As educational aspirations in general, the decision for degree mobility seems to be subject to social selectivity. In most countries, the share of Bachelor students planning to complete their Master abroad is higher among Bachelor students with higher education background than among those without higher education background (Figure 11.5b).

Figure 11.5

## Bachelor students' plans for continuation of studies abroad by educational background



**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, J.13, J.14. **No data:** DE, FR, IT. **Too few cases:** Bachelor students with HE background, Bachelor students without HE background: IE.

**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 1.8 Where do you plan to continue studying?

**Interpretation:** In MT, the share of students planning to continue their studies abroad is 18 percentage points higher among students with HE background than among students without HE background.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** FI, IE.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

- The percentage point difference to students without higher education background is relatively large (more than 10 percentage points) in Serbia, Malta, and Romania.
- This form of social selectivity is less expressed (1%-difference) or non-existent in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Sweden, Lithuania, Croatia, Finland, the Netherlands, and Slovakia.

In the large majority of countries, the potential for international degree mobility is also higher among students with higher education background, as indicated by the higher share of students being undecided where to complete their Master (as opposed to students without higher education background). If this potential is realised, the already existing educational background gap in degree mobility intentions in most countries may increase.

- In countries such as Serbia and Malta, however, the share of students who are undecided where to complete their Master is notably higher among students *without* higher education background, meaning that the large difference observed in degree mobility intentions may eventually attenuate.

Differences in educational aspirations are again less pronounced by sex than by educational background. In a majority of countries, the share of students wishing to continue their studies at home is slightly higher among men. Moreover, there are more countries in which the share of students planning to continue studying abroad is higher among women than countries in which this share is higher among men (Table A11.6).

## Discussion and policy considerations

The empirical analysis has shown that students in the EUROSTUDENT countries are, on balance, quite satisfied with their current study programmes. This holds true especially regarding the quality of teaching and the study facilities. Satisfaction with the organisation of the studies and the timetable and with the administration's attitude towards students ranges on somewhat lower levels. This might indicate a necessity to further improve the flexibility of degree structures and the efficiency and service mentality of higher education administrations. Ultimately, the ambitions and goals of higher education policy-makers in the countries of the EHEA will determine whether current satisfaction levels are sufficient or whether further efforts are needed to reach the goal of the EHEA becoming and staying one of the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economies in the world. Political attention may be needed especially in those countries where satisfaction levels are generally relatively low in international comparison (e.g. Austria, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, Montenegro and Romania).

In comparison to graduates of lower levels of the education system, graduates of higher education are known to have comparatively good employment prospects. Accordingly, considerable shares of students in the EUROSTUDENT countries assess their chances on the labour market as (very) good. Students in EUROSTUDENT countries tend to be more confident about their employment prospects on the national labour market than about those on the international labour market. This does not necessarily reflect a worse preparation for employment on the international labour market. It can also be related to the simple fact that students can better assess their chances on the national labour market. Another cross-country pattern is the apparent scepticism of students of humanities and arts about their chances on the labour market. The relatively critical assessment of teacher training students in some countries might also be a cause for concern, as one might argue that they need to believe in their professional future to be able to provide future generations with high-quality education. Beyond



cross-country patterns, country-specific patterns that require country-level solutions can be observed. For instance, comparatively large shares of students assess their chances on the national labour market as (very) poor in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, Montenegro, Romania, Serbia and Slovenia.

Regarding students' future educational aspirations, the analysis has revealed that a transition to further studies within a year after graduation from the current programme is still the standard envisaged pathway through higher education. However, there are also countries in which notable shares of students plan to follow flexible learning paths, i.e. to return to higher education after an interruption of more than one year (especially in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Estonia, Finland, Ireland, Lithuania, Malta, Montenegro, Norway and Sweden). Based on EUROSTUDENT data, it is difficult to appraise whether this is a positive result of higher education reforms or simply a reflection of longstanding traditions in study behaviour. In any case, the above-mentioned countries are those with comparatively old student populations (>Chapter 4) and thus with experience in dealing with students having to reconcile studies with employment and possible family duties. The direct transition countries (e.g. Armenia, Russia and Ukraine) are those with comparatively young student populations.

The EUROSTUDENT data also confirm the finding of previous studies that educational aspirations are contingent on students' educational background. In all covered countries, the share of students having plans for further studies is higher among students with higher education background than among those without higher education background. Moreover, the former seem to be more strongly oriented towards a transition to further studies without longer interruptions. This should be read against the background that access to higher education is already subject to social selectivity (>Chapter 3). Considering that access to higher education may influence students' chances of personality development, of preparing for the labour market and of becoming active and socially included citizens, efforts to reduce social inequalities in higher education such as those announced in the Bucharest Communiqué (2012) seem appropriate.

Finally, it has become apparent that students are willing to take up the opportunity for international degree mobility offered by the Bologna study architecture. However, this willingness differs by country. The share of Bachelor students planning to complete their Master abroad varies from more than 20 % in Armenia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Georgia, Malta, Montenegro and Serbia to less than 5 % in the Czech Republic and Ireland. This finding needs to be interpreted carefully, as degree mobility can be both a strategy to acquire international competencies through study abroad experience and a reaction to perceived insufficient study opportunities in the national higher education system. It is also plausible that international degree mobility is – even more so than credit mobility – a precursor of later international labour market mobility, meaning that some countries could eventually suffer disproportionately from brain drain, i.e. a permanent loss of their school and higher education graduates to other countries.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup> High levels of international degree mobility at the transition from the Bachelor to the Master might also have implications for data collection. Currently, most national student surveys focus on students who are currently enrolled in a respective higher education system. These surveys may still capture students who are abroad temporarily, but they tend to miss those going abroad for an entire degree. This means that estimations of, for instance, international mobility rates (>Chapter 10) and degrees of social selectivity are likely to become more imprecise with rising rates of international degree mobility.



The decision for international degree mobility seems to be subject to social selectivity: In most countries, the share of Bachelor students planning to complete their Master abroad is higher among Bachelor students with higher education background than among those without higher education background. This implies that potential positive outcomes of international degree mobility are also more likely to benefit students with higher education background.

# Tables

Table A11.1

## Students' satisfaction with their current study programme by type of higher education institution

Share of students who are (very) satisfied with a certain aspect (in %)

Country	Quality of teaching		Organisation of studies and timetable		Administration's attitude towards students		Study facilities	
	University	Non-university	University	Non-university	University	Non-university	University	Non-university
AM	73	74	70	64	76	78	68	70
AT	39	72	45	59	–	–	39	68
BA	48	91	41	73	43	83	38	89
CH	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
CZ	77	81	65	69	73	76	80	79
DE	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
DK	75	62	55	44	60	58	61	57
EE	76	81	68	63	78	74	81	82
FI	70	67	66	65	71	68	78	79
FR	69	72	36	45	–	–	–	–
GE	61	–	55	–	59	–	60	–
HR	46	53	36	41	60	57	47	60
HU	71	71	58	60	52	53	76	69
IE	86	82	74	69	68	67	86	64
IT	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
LT	58	65	65	65	53	62	67	63
LV	65	74	59	54	73	74	74	72
ME	54	–	45	–	60	–	36	–
MT	73	69	55	35	57	42	79	39
NL	69	57	73	56	54	47	70	58
NO	65	65	60	56	62	64	69	63
PL	67	68	46	53	47	56	68	72
RO	41	–	37	–	39	–	47	–
RS	64	63	54	56	58	53	67	56
RU	76	78	61	71	43	75	73	79
SE	69	–	54	–	62	–	74	–
SI	66	74	53	58	45	64	62	68
SK	69	–	50	–	49	–	65	–
UA	70	73	63	65	68	74	61	71

– no data

Data source: EUROSTUDENT V, J.2.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 1.11 How satisfied are you with your studies concerning the following points?

Notes: Students rated their satisfaction with their current study programme on a five-point scale ranging from "very satisfied" to "very dissatisfied" or "very well" to "not at all". For this table, the categories "very satisfied" and "satisfied" / "very well" and "well" were aggregated.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions: AT, BA, FI.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: DE, GE, IT.

Table A11.2

**Students' assessment of their chances on the labour market**

Share of students (in %)

Country	National level				International level			
	(Very) good	Fair	(Very) poor	Unable to rate	(Very) good	Fair	(Very) poor	Unable to rate
AM	64	16	12	8	44	22	18	16
AT	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
BA	19	25	44	12	38	22	24	16
CH	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
CZ	57	27	11	5	27	25	26	22
DE	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
DK	58	24	14	4	50	21	11	18
EE	63	24	9	4	42	26	15	17
FI	64	17	16	3	51	23	11	15
FR	52	28	20	–	36	36	28	–
GE	46	25	20	9	30	19	31	20
HR	35	27	34	4	44	23	22	11
HU	43	28	23	6	54	20	10	16
IE	58	10	24	8	71	10	8	11
IT	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
LT	42	28	23	7	31	24	28	17
LV	47	30	12	11	34	24	17	25
ME	27	23	38	12	35	15	25	25
MT	61	24	12	3	56	23	12	9
NL	62	19	14	5	42	20	17	21
NO	73	14	6	7	31	20	12	37
PL	39	33	24	4	39	26	21	14
RO	19	32	38	11	10	20	48	22
RS	24	32	36	8	42	21	21	16
RU	63	25	8	4	38	27	21	14
SE	67	12	9	12	40	14	10	36
SI	29	28	36	7	44	24	16	16
SK	32	34	25	9	30	25	22	23
UA	49	35	13	3	35	26	28	11

– no data

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, J.4. **No data:** AT, CH, DE, IT; unable to rate: FR.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 1.12 How do you rate your chances on the labour market after graduating from your current study programme?

**Notes:** Students assessed their chances on the labour market on a five-point scale ranging from “very good” to “very poor”. Moreover, they could indicate that they were “unable to rate” their chances on the labour market. Their answers were aggregated to four categories: (1) very good + good, (2) fair, (3) poor + very poor, (4) unable to rate.

**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** FR, MT, RU.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

Table A11.3

**Students' assessment of their chances on the labour market by study programme and type of higher education institution**

Share of students assessing their chances on the labour market as (very) good (in %)

Country	National level					International level				
	Bachelor	Master	University	Non-university	Total	Bachelor	Master	University	Non-university	Total
AM	64	66	64	58	64	44	42	44	38	44
AT	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
BA	19	20	19	42	19	38	40	38	65	38
CH	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
CZ	55	61	57	60	57	27	28	27	23	27
DE	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
DK	61	56	61	56	58	51	52	54	48	50
EE	60	68	61	68	63	40	41	40	49	42
FI	64	63	65	63	64	52	51	51	52	51
FR	43	44	48	60	52	34	30	32	47	36
GE	45	48	46	–	46	30	32	30	–	30
HR	34	27	35	36	35	47	37	43	47	44
HU	40	44	44	39	43	54	46	55	50	54
IE	57	63	58	58	58	72	72	72	70	71
IT	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
LT	42	44	42	41	42	31	29	30	32	31
LV	45	58	44	52	47	38	24	30	40	34
ME	27	27	27	–	27	33	42	35	–	35
MT	61	61	62	55	61	58	62	57	53	56
NL	62	60	61	62	62	42	45	48	38	42
NO	71	81	71	75	73	32	39	34	29	31
PL	38	38	41	37	39	42	35	41	37	39
RO	21	12	19	–	19	12	8	10	–	10
RS	25	23	25	18	24	43	40	43	32	42
RU	64	62	62	79	63	38	46	39	34	38
SE	62	70	67	–	67	37	47	40	–	40
SI	28	25	28	34	29	43	36	45	38	44
SK	29	30	32	–	32	30	25	30	–	30
UA	48	54	41	52	49	36	31	35	35	35

– no data

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, J.4.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 1.12 How do you rate your chances on the labour market after graduating from your current study programme?**Notes:** Students assessed their chances on the labour market on a five-point scale ranging from “very good” to “very poor”. Moreover, they could indicate that they were “unable to rate” their chances on the labour market. For this table, the categories “very good” and “good” were aggregated.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** FR, MT, RU.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

Table A11.4

**Bachelor students' assessment of their chances on the international labour market by field of study**

Share of Bachelor students assessing their chances on the labour market as (very) good (in %)

Country	Humanities and arts	Teacher training and education science	Engineering, manufacturing and construction	Natural sciences	Health and welfare	All fields of study
AM	46	37	45	45	43	44
AT	–	–	–	–	–	–
BA	37	27	54	38	40	38
CH	–	–	–	–	–	–
CZ	20	14	35	35	37	27
DE	–	–	–	–	–	–
DK	28	22	72	64	61	51
EE	32	29	47	49	57	40
FI	34	36	55	57	59	52
FR	29	14	49	41	32	34
GE	29	32	30	37	•	30
HR	37	31	60	55	63	47
HU	45	43	67	62	63	54
IE	57	68	80	78	86	72
IT	–	–	–	–	–	–
LT	20	18	32	50	47	31
LV	26	•	45	45	53	38
ME	29	•	45	34	54	33
MT	40	49	65	65	74	58
NL	32	18	67	69	42	42
NO	50	14	53	45	40	32
PL	41	–	51	51	47	42
RO	6	•	13	10	32	12
RS	31	30	46	54	58	43
RU	37	41	41	51	36	38
SE	16	20	49	53	52	37
SI	28	20	59	56	66	43
SK	32	17	39	39	37	30
UA	33	41	24	25	38	36

– no data • too few cases

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, J.7.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 1.12 How do you rate your chances on the labour market after graduating from your current study programme?**Notes:** Students assessed their chances on the labour market on a five-point scale ranging from “very good” to “very poor”. Moreover, they could indicate that they were “unable to rate” their chances on the labour market. For this table, the categories “very good” and “good” were aggregated.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** FR, MT, RU.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

Table A11.5

**Students' plans for continuation of studies by sex**

Share of students (in %)

Country	Yes, within a year after graduating from current programme		Yes, but not within a year after graduating from current programme		I don't know yet		No	
	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male
AM	54	55	8	11	35	31	3	3
AT	51	62	–	–	12	11	37	27
BA	41	36	17	19	34	34	8	11
CH	36	37	11	14	25	24	28	25
CZ	54	62	6	6	21	17	19	15
DE	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
DK	37	38	15	11	23	23	25	28
EE	31	31	20	21	40	38	9	10
FI	20	25	17	14	45	39	18	22
FR	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
GE	57	54	16	14	25	29	2	3
HR	43	40	10	11	31	32	16	17
HU	44	47	10	9	25	25	21	19
IE	35	38	25	20	30	30	10	12
IT	47	47	–	–	11	13	42	40
LT	30	28	16	16	39	37	15	19
LV	35	29	13	13	41	44	11	14
ME	42	39	22	19	26	28	10	14
MT	43	50	23	19	26	25	8	6
NL	35	36	12	11	30	30	23	23
NO	28	34	17	12	30	28	25	26
PL	43	39	11	13	28	29	18	19
RO	64	61	4	4	26	28	6	7
RS	40	38	13	16	36	34	11	12
RU	47	35	5	10	29	36	19	19
SE	23	25	13	8	34	34	30	33
SI	47	46	7	5	29	34	17	15
SK	51	51	4	3	24	26	21	20
UA	73	67	4	3	12	17	11	13

– no data

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, J.9.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 1.6 Are you planning to continue studying after finishing your current study programme(s)?**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** AT, FI, IT.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

Table A11.6

**Bachelor students' plans for continuation of studies abroad by sex**

Share of Bachelor students who plan to enrol in a Master programme (in %)

Country	Abroad		Undecided		At home	
	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male
AM	20	29	31	25	49	46
AT	10	8	23	18	67	74
BA	29	25	25	23	46	52
CH	8	8	19	19	73	73
CZ	4	4	8	12	88	84
DE	–	–	–	–	–	–
DK	7	6	15	20	78	74
EE	11	15	31	32	58	53
FI	8	7	18	8	74	85
FR	–	–	–	–	–	–
GE	25	26	31	32	44	42
HR	8	8	20	16	72	76
HU	9	9	14	13	77	78
IE	•	•	•	•	•	•
IT	–	–	–	–	–	–
LT	10	6	40	30	50	64
LV	10	12	27	23	63	65
ME	41	36	29	22	30	42
MT	21	22	38	41	41	37
NL	5	6	22	26	73	68
NO	10	9	29	23	61	68
PL	6	4	17	12	77	84
RO	16	16	22	24	62	60
RS	24	22	24	18	52	60
RU	8	13	24	26	68	61
SE	7	12	21	33	72	55
SI	10	17	27	27	63	56
SK	5	8	14	13	81	79
UA	5	7	13	14	82	79

– no data • too few cases

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V, J.14.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 1.6 Are you planning to continue studying after finishing your current study programme(s)?**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** FI, IE.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** DE, GE, IT.

## Chapter 12

### Executive summary

The Synopsis of Indicators presents the findings of the 5<sup>th</sup> round of the EUROSTUDENT project to which 30 countries of the EHEA have contributed between 2012 and 2015. It is a collection of key indicators on the social dimension of higher education and functions to monitor progress in the implementation of the Bologna Process reforms (Bucharest Communiqué, 2012). The Synopsis focuses on three main topic areas: access to higher education and characteristics of students (> [Chapters 2, 3, 4](#)), study conditions (> [Chapters 5, 6, 7, 8, 9](#)), as well as international student mobility and future plans (> [Chapters 10, 11](#)). The chapter sequence reflects the student life-cycle from transition into higher education to a forecast on future activities. This chapter provides an overview of the main issues and findings of the different chapters.

#### Transition into higher education

Widening access to higher education and improving the quality of higher education across Europe are perceived as central in creating knowledge-based societies and in enhancing the employability of higher education graduates (European Commission, 2011). The entry routes to higher education and students' transition pathways are vital in improving access for all.

> [Chapter 2](#), therefore, looks at students' transition into higher education across EUROSTUDENT countries and across student groups by examining different access routes to higher education, the time delay between obtaining a school leaving qualification and higher education participation, prior experience on the labour market, and the occurrence of interruptions during higher education.

While in all EUROSTUDENT countries for which data are available at least 70% of students have [entered higher education via a regular route](#), i.e. upper secondary qualification or central higher education entrance examination, results show that [alternative access routes](#) to higher education are offered in most EUROSTUDENT countries. These include adult learning, special entry exams for certain student groups, special access courses, and the accreditation/recognition of prior learning and/or vocational experience. In the majority of countries in which these routes are offered, especially students without higher education background, delayed transition, and older students benefit from these entry routes.

The results on the duration between leaving school for the first time and entering higher education also indicate that the pathway to higher education is not always direct: In around one fifth of the EUROSTUDENT countries, more than 20% of the students enter higher education with a [delay of more than 24 months](#). This chapter clearly highlights the fact that the educational trajectories and the needs of the students who have entered higher education with a delay of more than 24 months are different from the so-called 'traditional' students. They tend to enter higher education via an alternative route, more



often do not come from a higher education background and more often pursue their studies with low intensity. They also engage in paid employment alongside studies more often compared to all students (>Chapter 6).

*Work experience prior to entering higher education* is related to students' personal situations and characteristics. In almost all EUROSTUDENT countries, the share of students with prior work experience is higher among students without higher education background than among those with higher education background. In all of the EUROSTUDENT countries, the share of students with work experience before entering higher education is higher among students who are older than 30 years than among their younger peers.

In about 40% of EUROSTUDENT countries, at least 10% of students have interrupted their studies for at least one year between entering higher education and graduating. The share of students with *interruptions during their higher education* studies is especially high among older students and among delayed transition students compared to their respective counterparts. Further, students who experience an interruption during their higher education studies also share some characteristics with delayed transition students. More often these students are without higher education background, older, study with low intensity, and are dependent on their own income.

>Chapter 3, >Chapter 4, and >Chapter 5 further examine how 'non-traditional' students study in the different EUROSTUDENT countries. While expanding entry routes to higher education is one way of supporting these students, introducing flexible learning pathways and student-centred learning could be another way to reduce the occurrence of interruptions in these students' educational pathways and ensure successful graduation.

### Social background of students

The most common interpretation of the social dimension is that a state of participative equity should be attained in European higher education. Specific groups known to be traditionally underrepresented in higher education in many countries have typically been in the focus of interest with regard to adequate representation in higher education. One such group is that of students without higher education background, which is the focus of >Chapter 3.

*Students without higher education background*, also known as "first-generation students", make up between one and three quarters of the student population in the EUROSTUDENT countries. Results indicate that this group is special in several respects: Students without higher education background tend to enter higher education later, which goes hand-in-hand with a higher average age of this group. Furthermore, in most countries, these students make up a larger share of students at non-university institutions as opposed to universities. These results highlight that students without higher education background are a group that tends to study in a qualitatively different manner than students with higher education background.

Quantitatively, students without higher education background are also underrepresented in the vast majority of EUROSTUDENT countries. A state of *participative equity* –

defined as proportional representation of all educational backgrounds – has not (yet) been reached. In the majority of countries, students from the lowest educational background (fathers with ISCED 0–2, i.e. no higher than lower secondary education) are the group that is most strongly underrepresented. In slightly more than a third of countries, the medium educational background group, i.e. children of fathers with educational attainment at ISCED level –4, are the most underrepresented.

The analyses in the chapter cannot provide any insight into the reasons for the differences and underrepresentation found. The qualitatively different study choices and experiences which pertain directly to students' life circumstances and study experiences, however, may be a promising starting point for both higher education institutions and higher education policy wishing to improve the participation and experience of students without higher education background. Understanding in more detail how students without higher education background differ from their peers facilitates the development of targeted, tailored policy measures to support them in accessing and completing all kinds of studies at all kinds of HEIs.

### Characteristics of national student populations

The student body in European higher education has undergone significant changes over the past decades. In many countries, expansion of higher education has led to increased diversification of the student population. >Chapter 4 looks at the student populations in the different countries with a special focus on “non-traditional” students, i.e. students who deviate in some way from the majority of students previously making up the student body.

The central result of this chapter is that a “typical” student in one EUROSTUDENT country may be very different from a student in another. At the same time, two students in the same country may have very different life circumstances and backgrounds.

Large differences between as well as within countries exist with regard to *students' age*. Especially high mean ages and large shares of students older than 25 can be found in the Nordic countries Norway, Finland, and Sweden, whereas the former Soviet Union member states Armenia, Georgia, Russia, and Ukraine, which took part in EUROSTUDENT for the first time, are characterised by homogeneously young students populations. Related to the issue of age is that of *students with children*. The older the student population is on average, the more of the students are parents. The fact that students' children are largely younger than six years old points to a need for flexible study arrangements and childcare options for students who are parents.

As found in other studies, *female students* make up the majority of higher education students in almost all EUROSTUDENT countries. At the same time, gender segregation according to field of study still exists. In all covered countries, women dominate the humanities subjects, but are in the minority in engineering subjects. In some countries, there is a difference of more than 50 percentage points between the two subject areas with regard to the share of females.

The EUROSTUDENT data on *2<sup>nd</sup> generation migrants and students with impairment* presented in this chapter further showcase the diversity of student populations, showing again

that in all countries students with attributes that make them different from the “traditional” student participate in higher education.

In summary, this chapter highlights the diversity inherent in many student populations. Any policy measures at the national or institutional level should be designed with this diversity in mind in order to make sure that no students group is inadvertently excluded.

### Types and modes of study

> [Chapter 5](#) analyses the different types of study programmes offered in the EUROSTUDENT countries, with a special focus on differential enrolment by different student groups. The results indicate that different student groups do in fact tend to enrol in different types of study programmes.

Especially [short-cycle higher education programmes](#) and [long national programmes](#) appear to appeal to particular student groups. High shares of low intensity students, students without higher education background, delayed transition students, older students, and students dependent on their own earnings are enrolled in short-cycle higher education programmes. Based on the results from this chapter as well as other studies on short-cycle programmes, it can be concluded that these are important instruments for widening access to higher education for previously underrepresented student groups and in facilitating lifelong learning. While it is evident that a higher share of students without higher education background, older students, or those who enter higher education with a delay are making use of these programmes, at the same time it is also important to monitor these programmes closely with regard to their role in increasing social mobility, i.e. whether students who graduate from these programmes engage in further education. While short-cycle higher education programmes offer the possibility of achieving higher education, at the same time they might increase (horizontal) inequality in access to higher education if only certain types of students use them and/or if the graduates from these programmes do not continue with further education afterwards.

Another important aspect covered in this chapter is the issue of flexible study structure and [part-time courses](#). A large number of countries offer part-time courses to their students and many students are taking advantage of this opportunity. The students enrolled in part-time courses share some common characteristics across all countries. These students tend to be without higher education background, older, and dependent on their own income. The analysis of students' employment rate also shows that a higher share of students from these groups engage in employment alongside studies and dedicate a substantial share of their time budget towards paid jobs (> [Chapter 6](#)). This shows that students in these groups are apparently deliberately opting for part-time courses to meet their professional and educational demands.

### Time budget and employment

Interest in students' employment is growing, especially after the introduction of the Bologna reforms and the subsequent changes in the composition and characteristics of the student body entering and participating in higher education. In this context, > [Chapter 6](#) explores the patterns of students' employment, their motives for working, and their time budget in a typical study week during term-time.

Results indicate that **employment alongside higher education** is a reality in many countries. In more than half of the EUROSTUDENT countries, at least 40 % of students not living with parents engage in paid employment. Older students also engage in paid jobs more frequently than their younger peers. In almost two thirds of the EUROSTUDENT countries, ‘improving living standard’ is the most common reason why students take up paid jobs. In about one third of the EUROSTUDENT countries, the majority of students work during term-time to finance their living.

Students’ **motivation to work** is dependent on their educational background and age. In all EUROSTUDENT countries, students without higher education background take up paid jobs mainly to finance their living, whereas in the majority of countries students with higher education background work more often to gain experience. Likewise, in all of the EUROSTUDENT countries, older students (at least 30 years old) engage in paid employment more often to finance their living.

Similar to students’ employment rate, age is also related to **students’ time budget** and its composition. As already found in the last round of EUROSTUDENT, older students have a higher overall time budget, and they tend to spend considerably more time on paid jobs compared to their younger peers. The time budget of older students also tends to comprise activities with less formal structure, i.e. personal studies and paid jobs rather than taught studies. Overall, in most of the countries, students have a weekly time budget of more than 40 hours which includes time spent on taught studies, personal study time, and paid jobs. The weekly time budget of students not living with parents is relatively higher than that of their peers living at home. Increasing time spent on gainful employment is associated with a reduction in time for study-related activities as well as an overall increase in students’ time budget.

The findings in this chapter, together with findings from the previous chapter that many older students are formally or de-facto part-time students, suggests that in order to meet work and study demands, older students tend to favour flexible study arrangements. Provision of flexible study arrangements and part-time courses is therefore important in order to enable certain student groups to balance their professional and educational activities.

## Students’ resources

Participation in HE is a period of a few years which may cause a substantial financial burden for students. Therefore, sufficient funds available to students can be viewed as a necessary financial condition for taking up and successfully completing HE. > [Chapter 7](#) investigates different aspects of the income situation of students that are also relevant for assessing the status quo of the social dimension in the EHEA, namely, students’ average income, its distribution and concentration, its sources, and differences between different student groups.

Results show that the financial heterogeneity of students across the EUROSTUDENT countries is quite pronounced. In prosperous countries such as Norway, Sweden, and Switzerland, the **total income of students** who are not living with parents – at more than 2,000 Euro – is several times higher than for students in relatively low-GDP countries such as Armenia, Georgia, and Serbia, who receive less than 400 Euro a

month.<sup>1</sup> In the first group of countries, the price level is noticeably higher which also affects the subsistence level of students. For that reason alone, students in those countries would need higher amounts of money.

Financial heterogeneity with regard to student income does not only exist between countries, but also within countries. Within the national student populations, the *distribution of total monthly income* can diverge considerably. In Estonia, Poland, and Russia, the income of students who are not living with parents varies greatly within the student population. Student income is rather evenly distributed e.g. in Austria, Denmark, Germany, and the Netherlands. The financial dissimilarity of a national student body may be caused, inter alia, by different access of students to income sources which may create different burdens for the students' time budget (e.g. family support vs. own earnings). Of particular relevance are those students in the lowest income category as they may be at particular risk of having unfavourable financial conditions, affecting duration and success of their studies. Paying special attention to such vulnerable student groups is a defined goal of the social dimension of the EHEA.

On aggregate across countries, the students' families/partners are the most important *source of students' income*, providing about half of students' total monthly income. Students themselves earn about one third of their income through gainful employment. Public support accounts roughly for one tenth of students' means. The rest is provided by other sources. These results hold for both groups, students who are living with parents and those who are not. More disaggregated analyses show, however, that there appear to be different underlying core concepts in different countries, in which students are considered as either financially dependent on or independent of their parents. In those countries which follow the former concept, the combined ability of students and their families/partners to pay for HE may be a crucial determinant of participation in HE.

Across the EUROSTUDENT countries, there is some indication that *public support* is used to counteract social disparities between students in higher education, which would be well in line with EHEA countries' policy on disadvantaged student groups. On cross-country average, 37 % of students without HE background not living with parents receive direct state support, whereas the recipient quota among students with HE background living away from parents amounts to 33 %. Furthermore, in most countries, students without HE background receive more public support in absolute and relative terms than students with HE background. Whether the differences in the shares of recipients and the average monthly amounts granted are deemed appropriate in the countries needs to be explored in an in-depth analysis for each national system with a higher degree of distinction between different social groups of students.

Some implications of the use of different funding sources come to light when exploring the situation of *students depending on a specific income source*. Of students who are not living with parents, the highest total monthly income is, on cross-country average, available to those who depend on own earnings. Students with a dependency on family support receive the second highest income, and the lowest average income is available to stu-

<sup>1</sup> These values do not take into account differences in purchasing power.



dents who depend on public support. Further analysis has shown that there are apparently some differences in the living situation of students who belong to these groups. Students who depend on own earnings, for instance, are on cross-country average five years older than their peers who depend on public support. In contrast to younger students, older students tend more towards living with partner and having children, which may cause higher costs. This may mean, however, that older students have more difficulties (or at worst: no chance at all) to finance their studies mainly by public support. In the face of aging populations and the call for lifelong learning societies – with second chance routes to further qualifications – it may be doubtful whether the current priorities of the funding schemes in the EHEA countries are already in line with such challenges and goals.

### Students' expenses

After having analysed students' income in >Chapter 7, >Chapter 8 examines students' expenses. What are the main costs students face, and how does this affect their overall financial situation? Can differences between student groups be identified?

Results show that students and their families/partners dedicate, on cross-country average, more than four fifths of their combined expenses to *students' living costs*. Study-related costs make up only about one sixth of total expenses. Roughly, this holds for both students living with parents and those not living with parents. This emphasises that students' living costs are by far the greatest financial obstacle that students and their families/partners have to take.

When analyzing specific cost components in more detail, it appears that *accommodation including utilities* is typically the most expensive expenditure item, especially for students not living with parents. When differentiating between several types of accommodation, it becomes apparent that students living with their partner / children have, on average across countries, the highest monthly expenses for accommodation. In contrast, student accommodation turns out to be the cheapest form of housing outside the parental home. In this respect, students depending on a specific income source show different spending behaviours. Those who depend on family support spend the highest average amount per month on accommodation, while their peers who are depending on own earnings pay slightly less for this purpose and students depending on public support have clearly the lowest spending on housing. The latter group is more often than average living in student accommodation (>Chapter 9). As housing space seems to become increasingly scarce, especially in bigger cities, the provision of student accommodation may gain more importance, as this is a cost-effective instrument supplying students with the chance to live away from their parents' home at affordable prices. This is especially important for those students who have no choice but to leave their family home in order to attend HE.

*Fees to HEIs* are another important expenditure item, which may strain the students' budget considerably. Analyses by type of study programme bring to light that Bachelor students spend on average only a marginally lower share of total expenses on fees than their peers in Master programmes. Further, in half of the countries, students at non-universities have higher average expenses for fees than students at universities. Analyses show that there are further considerable differences between countries with respect

to policies on fees. In Switzerland, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Italy, Croatia, and Slovakia, a large majority of Bachelor students has to pay fees and at the same time does not receive public support. In Latvia, Montenegro, and Malta, only a minority of Bachelor students is charged with fees and a majority of those affected does receive public support. This can be viewed as different basic conceptions in which either the market-mechanism or the public sector plays a more prominent role.

When questioned about their overall financial situation, in almost all countries, the majority of students report to currently have moderate *financial difficulties* at the most. There is a group of 10 countries, however, in which more than a third of students indicate having either serious or very serious financial difficulties. Students not living with parents more often report financial distress than their peers who live with their parents. When looking at students not living with parents who depend on a specific income source, further insight is gained into the problem. On average across countries, 29 % of students dependent on family support report to have (very) serious financial difficulties. The respective share among students dependent on own earnings is 33 % and it is highest among those who depend on public support with 38 %. By their nature, the EUROSTUDENT data cannot provide information on students depending on public support who abandon their studies or potential students who abstain from taking up studies due to (the prospect of) insufficient financial means. However, this group of students seems to be exposed to a higher risk of doing so compared to other student groups with access to other financial sources. Therefore, a further investigation at the national level into the reasons for students' financial difficulties might be helpful in determining whether the extent of public support to students can be deemed appropriate in the respective countries.

### Housing situation

The type of housing can be quite influential on the day-to-day organisation and experience of students. >Chapter 9 examines questions related to student housing, with a special focus on student accommodation, and additionally takes a look at students' satisfaction with their housing.

Results indicate that, in most of the EUROSTUDENT countries, the majority of students are living away from their parents. At the same time, living with parents is in relative terms the single most common *form of housing* in two thirds of the EUROSTUDENT countries. The geographical spread of students living with parents replicates the North-South divide that has been extensively discussed in previous studies, with students in Southern countries appearing to stay at their parents' home much longer than students in Northern European countries.

The investigation of students living in *student accommodation* has shown that this form of residence seems to be the chosen form of housing for students that are, on average, younger and more intensively involved in their studies. In most countries, students depending on public support especially appear to use designated student accommodation, which is at the same time supportive for students without HE background, who are more often dependent on public support than on family support or own earnings. In this way, student accommodation may serve an important function for these students. Furthermore, students living in student accommodation have the shortest com-

mute in almost all countries, indicating that those students are able to live in close vicinity to the HEI attended.

*Students' satisfaction with their housing situation* is rather high on average across countries, although there are some differences with regard to the forms of housing. About three quarters of all students – both those living with parents as well as those not living with parents – are (very) satisfied with their current housing situation across countries. Students living in student accommodation are, on average, clearly less satisfied than students living without their parents in other forms of housing and students living with parents. Only three fifths of students in student accommodation state that they are (very) satisfied with their lodging. Student accommodation appears to be an ambivalent form of housing: On the one hand, it is across countries the cheapest form of housing outside the parental home in terms of accommodation costs (> [Chapter 8](#)). Furthermore, it seems that this type of housing is often in spatial proximity to the HEI attended, allowing students to use modes of transportation that are likewise cost-saving and eco-friendly. On the other hand, student accommodation does not seem to be an especially popular form of housing in most countries. This seems to be an additional price students currently have to pay. Any improvement of the situation of students in student accommodation, however, requires an on-site analysis of the underlying major problems, which may differ not only between countries, but also within.

## Mobility and internationalisation

The international mobility of students continues to be a focus area of higher education policy in Europe. > [Chapter 10](#) examines students' international mobility (realised and planned), obstacles to enrolment abroad, organisation and funding of enrolment abroad, and the recognition of credits earned abroad. As an indicator of internationalisation at home, the extent to which students' national study programmes are taught in foreign language is examined.

Results indicate that *international student mobility rates* vary greatly by country. Between 5 % and 39 % of students in the cross-sectional EUROSTUDENT samples have realised an enrolment, an internship, a language course or another study-related experience abroad. This strong variation may raise the question of whether it is reasonable for different countries in the EHEA to have very similar benchmarks regarding international mobility rates. Enrolment abroad tends to be the most frequently realised foreign study-related experience. Judging by the share of *students who have not been abroad but plan to go*, the potential to further increase the foreign enrolment rate seems to be particularly high in Armenia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, Georgia, Serbia, Slovakia, and Ukraine.

The analyses in this chapter also confirm the results of previous research in that access to international student mobility can be shown to be subject to *social selectivity*. To begin with, international mobility is contingent on students' social background: In all besides a few countries (Armenia, Serbia, and Ukraine), the share of students who have studied abroad temporarily is higher among students with higher education background than among students without higher education background. Additionally, the shares of students having realised an internship or a language course are mostly higher among students with higher education background. This can be considered problematic



against the background that international mobility during studies may positively influence students' personality development and employment prospects. At present, the opportunity of reaping the benefits of international mobility is thus apparently unequally distributed across social groups. This finding reinforces the importance of compensatory measures such as those announced in the EHEA Mobility Strategy (2012). Foreign enrolment rates also differ by field of study. They tend to be particularly low among students of teacher training and education science.

To date, the further expansion of international mobility rates is hampered by a number of *obstacles to mobility*. In this respect, a cross-country pattern has become apparent: The most critical of the analysed obstacles to studying abroad is the (perceived) additional financial burden. Other than attitudinal or motivational obstacles, which need to be tackled early on in students' educational history and which are hard to eliminate once students have entered higher education, financial obstacles would seem to qualify as solvable problems. Not only an enhancement of funding schemes and amounts, but also better information on these funding opportunities seem to be needed. A separation from partner, children, and friends has turned out to be the second most critical obstacle, particularly in countries where student populations are comparatively old and therefore more likely to have children and to be reliant on own income. Obstacles that the analyses have revealed to be less critical are insufficient foreign language skills, expected problems with the recognition of credits gained abroad and a lack of information provided by the home institution.

A large degree of variation across countries can also be observed regarding the *organisation, funding and recognition of foreign enrolment periods*. Concerning the organisation of foreign enrolments, EU programmes are the most frequently chosen solution. In the majority of countries, EU programmes are used by more than half of the students who enrol abroad temporarily. Enrolment abroad without a mobility programme tends to be the second most frequently chosen solution. Accordingly, public sources and means from parents, family or partner have turned out to be the primary sources of funding for enrolment periods abroad. Although familial support is not always the primary source of funding, large shares of students receive at least some familial support in most countries. In this respect, a probable source of the social selectivity of international mobility has been observed, namely that students with higher education background are more likely to receive familial support than students without higher education background. A further expansion of socially compensatory mobility schemes may thus be needed in many countries. The recognition of the credits gained during a period of study abroad seems to be common in most EUROSTUDENT countries. In 19 out of 26 examined countries, more than 70 % of students who gained credit during an enrolment abroad had their credits either fully or partly recognised upon return. However, there are also countries with comparatively large potential to improve recognition procedures. In Armenia, Russia, and Ukraine, for instance, comparatively large shares of students have not had their credits recognised (yet). It should, however, be kept in mind that recognition may depend on the destination countries of students. One would expect that national student populations who are primarily realising their stays abroad within the EHEA should be more likely to have their credits gained abroad recognised.

Finally, this chapter has examined the extent to which students' *national study programmes are taught in foreign languages* in order to approximate the extent of internationalisation at home. The share of students whose domestic study programme is taught in a foreign language (usually English) ranges from more than 20% in Denmark, Finland and Sweden to less than 5% in Croatia, the Czech Republic, Georgia, Ireland, Malta, Russia, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, and Ukraine. In the Nordic countries and the Netherlands, this share is even quite substantially higher among Master students. Generally, the countries in which this share is high/low are also those in which the international mobility rate of students tends to be high/low. It thus seems that a high credit mobility propensity of a national student population is also reflected in a high degree of internationalisation at home. This can be read as support for the argument that internationalisation at home may not only be an alternative to physical mobility, but also a preparation for later physical mobility, as it may attract students from abroad and thereby allow national students to learn in culturally diverse settings right from the start of their studies.

### Students' assessment of their studies and future plans

> *Chapter 11*, as the last chapter in this report, presents an assessment of students' previous experiences in higher education in conjunction with an analysis of their plans for future studies.

The empirical analysis shows that the *satisfaction of students* with their current study programmes in the EUROSTUDENT countries is, on balance, quite high. This holds true especially regarding the quality of teaching and the study facilities. Satisfaction with the organisation of the studies and the timetable and with the administration's attitude towards students ranges on somewhat lower levels, possibly indicating the need for further improvement with regard to flexibility of degree structures and the efficiency and service mentality of higher education administrations.

In comparison to graduates of lower levels of the education system, graduates of higher education are known to have comparatively good employment prospects. Accordingly, considerable shares of students in the EUROSTUDENT countries assess their *chances on the labour market* as (very) good. Students in EUROSTUDENT countries tend to be more confident about their employment prospects on the national labour market than about those on the international labour market, an assessment which may partly be related to the fact that students can better assess their chances on the former than the latter. Another cross-country pattern is the apparent scepticism of students of humanities and arts about their chances on the labour market.

Regarding *students' plans for continuing their education*, the analysis has revealed that a transition to further studies within a year after graduation from the current programme is still the standard pathway through higher education. However, there are also countries in which notable shares of students plan to follow flexible learning paths, i.e. to return to higher education after an interruption of more than one year. These countries are those with comparatively old student populations and thus with experience in dealing with students having to reconcile studies with employment and possible family duties. The direct transition countries are those with comparatively young student populations.

The EUROSTUDENT data also confirm the finding of previous studies that educational aspirations are contingent on students' educational background. In all covered countries, the share of students having plans for further studies is higher among students with higher education background than among those without higher education background. Moreover, the former seem to be more strongly oriented towards a transition to further studies without longer interruptions. Finally, it becomes apparent that students are generally willing to take up the opportunity for international degree mobility offered by the Bologna study architecture. However, this willingness differs by country, with shares of *Bachelor students planning to complete their Master abroad* varying between 3 % and 39 %. The decision for international degree mobility also seems to be subject to social selectivity: In most countries, the share of Bachelor students planning to complete their Master abroad is higher among Bachelor students with higher education background than among those without higher education background. This implies that potential positive outcomes of international degree mobility are also more likely to benefit students with higher education background.

### Further data on the social dimension

The Synopsis of Indicators covers only part of the data collected by the EUROSTUDENT project. All in all, 147 indicators on the topics covered in this report were delivered by the EUROSTUDENT national teams, often differentiated for each of the 21 focus groups ([> Introduction](#)).

All of these indicators are available via the Data Reporting Module ([> DRM](#)) on the EUROSTUDENT website [www.eurostudent.eu](http://www.eurostudent.eu). National teams have provided additional comments on country results which are also available there. National profiles offer insights into the higher education system of the different countries.

Additional information on concrete measures addressing the social dimension of higher education is available in the PL4SD database. The database is maintained by the project 'Peer Learning for the Social Dimension' (PL4SD) and presents measures which share the common objective of reducing barriers to higher education access and of providing a conducive study environment for all students that can lead to their successful completion of higher education ([www.pl4sd.eu](http://www.pl4sd.eu)).

Interested researchers as well as policy-makers are invited and encouraged to make use of the wealth of data available through the EUROSTUDENT project to further investigate relevant questions in order to continuously monitor and improve the social dimension of higher education in the European Higher Education Area.

## References

- Arum, R., Gamoran, A., & Shavit, Y.** (2007). More inclusion than diversion: Expansion, differentiation, and market structure in higher education. In Y. Shavit, R. Arum, & A. Gamoran (Eds.), *Stratification in higher education: A comparative study* (pp. 1–35). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Auers, D., Rostoks T., & Smith K.** (2007). Flipping burgers or flipping pages? Student employment and academic attainment in post-Soviet Latvia. *Communist and Post-Communist Studies*, 40, 477–491.
- Ballowitz, J., Netz, N., & Sanfilippo, D.** (2014). Intelligence brief: Are teacher training students internationally mobile? Retrieved from <http://tinyurl.com/pos59wb>
- Barone, C.** (2011). Some things never change: Gender segregation in higher education across eight nations and three decades. *Sociology of Education*, 84, 157–176.
- Becker, R., & Hecken, A. E.** (2009). Why are working-class children diverted from universities? An empirical assessment of the Diversion Thesis. *European Sociological Review*, 25, 233–250.
- Beerkens, M., Mägi, E., & Lill, L.** (2010). University studies as a side job: Causes and consequences of massive student employment in Estonia. *Higher Education*, 61, 679–692.
- Bergen Communiqué** (2005). The European Higher Education Area – Achieving the goals. Retrieved from [http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/hogeronderwijs/bologna/documents/MDC/050520\\_Bergen\\_Communique1.pdf](http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/hogeronderwijs/bologna/documents/MDC/050520_Bergen_Communique1.pdf)
- Berlin Communiqué** (2003). Realising the European Higher Education Area. Retrieved from [http://www.ehea.info/Uploads/about/Berlin\\_Communique1.pdf](http://www.ehea.info/Uploads/about/Berlin_Communique1.pdf)
- Bologna Declaration** (1999). The Bologna declaration of June 1999. Joint declaration of the European Ministers of Education. Retrieved from [http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/hogeronderwijs/bologna/documents/MDC/BOLOGNA\\_DECLARATION1.pdf](http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/hogeronderwijs/bologna/documents/MDC/BOLOGNA_DECLARATION1.pdf)
- Boudon, R.** (1974). Education, opportunity, and social inequality. Changing prospects in Western society. New York: Wiley.
- Bourdieu, P.** (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgment of taste*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Breen, R., & Goldthorpe, J. H.** (1997). Explaining educational differentials. Towards a formal rational action theory. *Rationality and Society*, 9, 275–305.
- Breen, R., Luijkx, R., Müller, W., & Pollak, R.** (2010). Long-term trends in educational inequality in Europe: Class inequalities and gender differences. *European Sociological Review*, 26, 31–48.
- Bucharest Communiqué** (2012). Making the most of our potential: Consolidating the European Higher Education Area. Retrieved from <http://www.ehea.info/Uploads/%281%29/Bucharest%20Communique%202012%281%29.pdf>
- Buchmann, C., & DiPrete, T.** (2006). The growing female advantage in college completion: The role of family background and academic achievement. *American Sociological Review*, 71, 515–541.
- Buchmann, C., DiPrete, T., & McDaniel, A.** (2008). Gender inequalities in education. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 34, 319–337.
- Buchmann, M. C., & Kriesi, I.** (2011). Transition to adulthood in Europe. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 37, 481–503.

- Cairns, D.** (2011). Youth, precarity and the future: Undergraduate housing transitions in Portugal during the economic crisis. *Sociologia, Problemas e Práticas*, 66, 9–25.
- Callender, C.** (2008). The impact of term-time employment on higher education students' academic attainment and achievement. *Journal of Education Policy*, 23, 359–377.
- Camilleri, A. F., & Mühleck, K.** (2010). *Evolving diversity. An overview of equitable access to HE in Europe*. Brussels: Equinet Consortium.
- Charles, M., & Bradley, K.** (2009). Indulging our gendered selves? Sex segregation by field of study in 44 countries. *American Journal of Sociology*, 114, 924–976.
- Curtis, S.** (2007). Students' perceptions of the effects of term-time paid employment. *Education and Training*, 49, 380–390.
- Curtis, S., & Williams, J.** (2002). The reluctant workforce: Undergraduates' part-time employment. *Education and Training*, 44, 5–10.
- de Boer, H., Enders, J., & Schimank, U.** (2007). On the way towards new public management? The governance of university systems in England, the Netherlands, Austria, and Germany. In D. Jansen (Ed.), *New forms of governance in research organizations* (pp. 137–152). Dordrecht: Springer.
- de Smedt, M., & van den Berg, J.** (2001). *Disability and social participation in Europe*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- Delmelle, E. M., & Delmelle, E. C.** (2012). Exploring spatio-temporal commuting patterns in a university environment. *Transport Policy*, 21, 1–9.
- Doyle, S., Gendall, P., Meyer, L. H., Hoek, J., Tait, C., McKenzie, L., & Loorparg, A.** (2010). An investigation of factors associated with student participation in study abroad. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 14, 471–490.
- Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency** (2012). *The European Higher Education Area in 2012: Bologna process implementation report*. Brussels: Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency.
- EHEA Mobility Strategy** (2012). *Mobility for better learning. Mobility strategy 2020 for the European Higher Education Area*. Retrieved from [http://www.ehea.info/Uploads/\(1\)/2012 EHEA Mobility Strategy.pdf](http://www.ehea.info/Uploads/(1)/2012 EHEA Mobility Strategy.pdf)
- European Central Bank** (2014a). *Eurosystem, exchange rates, half-yearly*. Retrieved from <http://sdw.ecb.europa.eu/browseSelection.do?DATASET=o&sfl1=4&FREQ=H&sfl3=4&node=2018794>
- European Central Bank** (2014b). *Euro area inflation*. Retrieved from: <https://www.ecb.europa.eu/ecb/educational/hicp/html/index.en.html>
- European Commission, EACEA, Eurydice** (2014). *Modernisation of higher education in Europe: Access, retention, and employability 2014*. Luxembourg: Publications office of the European Union.
- European Commission** (2005). *A new framework strategy for multilingualism*. Brussels: European Commission. Retrieved from <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52005DC0596&from=EN>
- European Commission** (2011). *Supporting growth and jobs – An agenda for the modernisation of Europe's higher education systems*. Brussels: European Commission.
- Eurostat** (2012). *Median age [Table]*. Data set TPS00061. Retrieved from [http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/product\\_details/dataset?p\\_product\\_code=TPS00061](http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/product_details/dataset?p_product_code=TPS00061)
- Eurostat** (2013). *EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS): Detailed annual survey results [Database]*. Retrieved from <http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/>
- Eurostat** (2014a). *Comparative price levels [Table]*. Retrieved from <http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/tgm/table.do?tab=table&init=1&plugin=1&language=en&pcode=tec00120>



- Eurostat** (2014b). GDP per capita in PPS [Table]. Retrieved from <http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/tgm/table.do?tab=table&init=1&language=en&pcode=tec00114&plugin=1>
- Eurostat** (2014c). Euro/ECU exchange rates, quarterly data [Table]. Retrieved from [http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/show.do?dataset=ert\\_bil\\_eur\\_q&lang=en](http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/show.do?dataset=ert_bil_eur_q&lang=en)
- Eurydice** (2014). National student fee and support systems in European higher education 2014/15. Eurydice facts and figures. Retrieved from [http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/documents/facts\\_and\\_figures/fees\\_support.pdf](http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/documents/facts_and_figures/fees_support.pdf)
- Frenette, M.** (2006). Too far to go on? Distance to school and university participation. *Education Economics*, 14, 31–58.
- Fuller, M., Georgeson, J., Healey, M., Hurst, A., Kelly, K., Riddell, S., Roberts, H., & Weedon, E.** (2009). *Improving disabled students' learning: Experiences and outcomes*. New York: Routledge.
- Gilardi, S., & Guglielmetti, C.** (2011). University life of non-traditional students: Engagement styles and impact on attrition. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 82, 33–53.
- Griga, D.** (2013). Factors influencing the chances of immigrant and non-immigrant groups to access higher education in the EU countries. In A. F. Camilleri & K. Mühleck (eds.), *Evolving diversity II. Participation of students with an immigrant background in European higher education* (pp. 7–16). Brussels: EquNet Consortium.
- Hammond, S.** (2006). Effects of employment on student academic services. Retrieved from [http://www.byu.edu/hr/sites/default/files/effects\\_of\\_student\\_employment.pdf](http://www.byu.edu/hr/sites/default/files/effects_of_student_employment.pdf)
- Hillmert, S., & Jacob, M.** (2010). Selections and social selectivity on the academic track: A life-course analysis of educational attainment in Germany. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, 28, 59–76.
- Humburg, M., van der Velden, R., & Verhagen, A.** (2013). *The employability of higher education graduates: The employers' perspective*. Brussels: European Commission.
- Jackson, M., Jonsson, J. O., & Rudolphi, F.** (2012). Ethnic inequality in choice-driven education systems: A longitudinal study of performance and choice in England and Sweden. *Sociology of Education*, 85, 158–178.
- Jacob, M., & Klein, M.** (2013). Der Einfluss der Bildungsherkunft auf den Berufseinstieg und die ersten Erwerbsjahre von Universitätsabsolventen. *Beiträge zur Hochschulforschung*, 35, 8–37.
- Johnstone, D. B.** (2009). Worldwide trends in financing higher education: A conceptual framework. In J. Knight (Ed.), *Financing access and equity in higher education* (pp. 1–18). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Johnstone, D. B.** (2013). The politics of higher education: Common misunderstandings about the financing of higher education. *Peking University Education Review*, 2013, 2, 36–45.
- Kelo, M., Teichler, U., & Wächter, B.** (2006). *EU-RODATA. Student mobility in European higher education*. Bonn: Lemmens.
- Kim, K. A.** (2002). ERIC review: Exploring the meaning of “nontraditional” at the Community College. *Community College Review*, 30, 74–89.
- Kirsch, M., Beernaert Y., & Nørgaard S.** (2003). *Tertiary short cycle education in Europe – A comparative study*. Brussels: EURASHE.
- Krücken, G., & Meier, F.** (2006). Turning the university into an organizational actor. In G. Drori, J. Meyer, & H. Hwang (Eds.), *Globalization and organization. World society and organizational change* (pp. 241–257). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kuhar, M., & Reiter, H.** (2014). Leaving home in Slovenia: A quantitative exploration of residential independence among young adults. *Journal of Adolescence*, 37, 1409–1419.

**Lane, D., & Gibbons, F.** (2007). Am I the typical student? Perceived similarity to student prototypes predicts success. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 33, 1380–1391.

**Leitner, M.** (2009).  $\text{cost}_{\text{FH}} < \text{cost}_{\text{Uni}}$ ? Ein Vergleich der Kosten eines Studiums an Fachhochschulen und an Universitäten anhand ausgewählter Fächer. *Die Neue Hochschule*, 50, 8–13.

**London Communiqué** (2007). Towards the European Higher Education Area: Responding to challenges in a globalised world. Retrieved from [http://www.ehea.info/Uploads/Declarations/London\\_Communique-18May2007.pdf](http://www.ehea.info/Uploads/Declarations/London_Communique-18May2007.pdf)

**Lucas, S. R.** (2001). Effectively maintained inequality: Education transitions, track mobility, and social background effects. *American Journal of Sociology*, 106, 1642–1690.

**Luetzelberger, T.** (2014). Independence or interdependence: Norms of leaving home in Italy and Germany. *European Societies*, 16, 28–47.

**Madhani, N.** (2012). Nontraditional students in higher education: Methodologies and approaches. Research review paper, Department of Educational Studies (EDST), University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada.

**McDaniel, A.** (2012). Women's advantage in higher education: Towards understanding a global phenomenon. *Sociology Compass*, 6, 581–595.

**Messer, D., & Wolter, S. C.** (2007). Are student exchange programs worth it? *Higher Education*, 54, 647–663.

**Metcalf, H.** (2003). Increasing inequality in higher education: The role of term-time working. *Oxford Review of Education*, 29, 315–329.

**Metzer, C., & Schulmeister, R.** (2011). Die tatsächliche Workload im Bachelorstudium. Eine empirische Untersuchung durch Zeitbudget-Analysen. In S. Nickel (Ed.) *Der Bologna-Prozess aus Sicht der Hochschulforschung*. Analysen und Im-

pulse für die Praxis (68–78). Gütersloh: Centrum für Hochschulentwicklung.

**Middendorff, E., Apolinariski, B., Poskowsky, J., Kandulla, M., & Netz, N.** (2013). Die wirtschaftliche und soziale Lage der Studierenden in Deutschland 2012. 20. Sozialerhebung des Deutschen Studentenwerks durchgeführt durch das HIS-Institut für Hochschulforschung. Bonn, Berlin: BMBF.

**Mühleck, K.** (2010). Data & methods. In A. F. Camilleri, & K. Mühleck (Eds.), *Evolving diversity. An overview of equitable access to HE in Europe*. Brussels: EquNet Consortium.

**Mühleck, K.** (2013). Second-generation immigrants in higher education – Sketching the European picture. In A. F. Camilleri, & K. Mühleck (Eds.), *Evolving diversity II. Participation of students with an immigrant background in European higher education*. Brussels: EquNet Consortium.

**Netz, N.** (2012). Studienbezogene Auslandsmobilität und Berufsverbleib von Hochschulabsolvent(inn)en. In M. Grotheer, S. Isleib, N. Netz, & K. Briedis (Eds.), *Hochqualifiziert und gefragt. Ergebnisse der zweiten HIS-HF Absolventenbefragung des Jahrgangs 2005* (pp. 259–313). Hannover: Hochschul-Informations-System.

**Netz, N.** (2013). What deters students from studying abroad? Evidence from four European countries and its implications for higher education policy. *Higher Education Policy*, 1–24. Advance online publication.

**Neugebauer, M., & Schindler, S.** (2012). Early transitions and tertiary enrolment: The cumulative impact of primary and secondary effects on entering university in Germany. *Acta Sociologica*, 55, 19–36.

**OANDA** (2014). Average exchange rates [Database]. Retrieved from <http://www.oanda.com/currency/average>

**OECD** (2010). PISA 2009 results. Overcoming social background. Equity in learning opportunities and outcomes, Vol. II. Paris: OECD.

- OECD** (2014). *Education at a glance 2014*. OECD Indicators. Paris: OECD.
- Orr, D.** (2010). Integrating an aging student population into higher education – Challenges for evidence-based policy in Europe. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 40, 25–42.
- Orr, D.** (2012). Widening access to higher education – What can EUROSTUDENT say about the new challenges emerging for teaching and learning? In A. Curaj, P. Scott, L. Vlasceanu, & L. Wilson (Eds.), *European higher education at the crossroads: Between the Bologna Process and national reforms* (pp. 173–189). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Orr, D., Gwosć, C., & Netz, N.** (2011). *Social and economic conditions of student life in Europe. Synopsis of Indicators. Final report. EUROSTUDENT IV 2008–2011*. Bielefeld: W. Bertelsmann Verlag.
- Orr, D., Schnitzer, K., & Frackmann, E.** (2008). *Social and economic conditions of student life in Europe. Synopsis of Indicators. Final report. EUROSTUDENT III 2005–2008*. Bielefeld: W. Bertelsmann Verlag.
- Orr, D., Wespel, J., & Usher, A.** (2014). *Do changes in cost-sharing have an impact on the behaviour of students and higher education institutions? Evidence from nine case studies, Vol. I, Comparative Report*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- Orr, D., & Hovdhaugen, E.** (2014). 'Second chance' routes into higher education: Sweden, Norway and Germany compared. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 33, 45–61.
- Prague Communiqué** (2001). *Towards the European Higher Education Area*. Retrieved from [http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/hogeronderwijs/bologna/documents/MDC/PRAGUE\\_COMMUNIQUE.pdf](http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/hogeronderwijs/bologna/documents/MDC/PRAGUE_COMMUNIQUE.pdf)
- Reimer, D., & Jacob, M.** (2011). Differentiation in higher education and its consequences for social inequality: introduction to a special issue. *Higher Education*, 61, 223–227.
- Reimer, D., & Pollak, R.** (2010). Educational expansion and its consequences for vertical and horizontal inequalities in access to higher education in West Germany. *European Sociological Review*, 26, 415–430.
- Rodrigues, M.** (2013). *Does student mobility during higher education pay? Evidence from 16 European countries*. Luxemburg: European Commission.
- Sachs, D., & Schreuer, N.** (2011). Inclusion of students with disabilities in higher education: Performance and participation in student's experiences. *Disabilities Studies Quarterly*, 31.
- Salisbury, M. H., Umbach, P. D., Paulsen, M. B., & Pascarella, E. T.** (2009). *Going Global: Understanding the Choice Process of the Intent to Study Abroad*. *Research in Higher Education*, 50, 119–143.
- Schneider, H., & Franke, B.** (2014). *Bildungsentscheidungen von Studienberechtigten. Studienberechtigte 2012 ein halbes Jahr vor und ein halbes Jahr nach Schulabschluss*. Hannover: DZHW.
- Schudde, L. T.** (2011). The causal effect of campus residency on college student retention. *The Review of Higher Education*, 34, 581–610.
- Schuetze, H. G., & Slowey, M.** (2002). *Participation and exclusion: A comparative analysis of non-traditional students and lifelong learners in higher education*. *Higher Education*, 44, 309–327.
- Schwarzenberger, A.** (2008). *Public/private funding of higher education: A social balance*. Hannover: Hochschul-Informations-System.
- Shavit, Y., & Blossfeld, H.-P.** (1993). *Persistent inequality: Changing educational attainment in thirteen countries*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Slantcheva-Durst, S.** (2010). Chapter 1: Redefining short-cycle higher education across Europe: The challenges of Bologna. *Community College Review*, 38, 111–132.



- Souto-Otero, M., Huisman, J., Beerkens, M., de Wit, H., & Vujić, S.** (2013). Barriers to international student mobility: Evidence from the Erasmus program. *Educational Researcher*, 42, 70–77.
- Spiess, C. K., & Wrohlich, K.** (2010). Does distance determine who attends a university in Germany? *Economics of Education Review*, 29, 470–479.
- Teichler, U., Ferencz, I., & Wächter, B.** (2011). Mapping mobility in European higher education. Volume I: Overview and trends. Bonn: DAAD.
- Tessema, M. T., Ready, K. J., & Astani, M.** (2014). Does part-time job affect college students' satisfaction and academic performance (GPA)? The case of a mid-sized public university. *International Journal of Business Administration*, 5, 50–59.
- Triventi, M.** (2013). Stratification in higher education and its relationship with social inequality: A comparative study of 11 European countries. *European Sociological Review*, 29, 489–502.
- UNESCO Institute for Statistics** (2006). *International Standard Classification of Education: ISCED 1997*. Retrieved from <http://www.uis.unesco.org/Library/Documents/isced97-en.pdf>
- UNESCO Institute for Statistics** (2012). *International Standard Classification of Education: ISCED 2011*. Retrieved from <http://www.uis.unesco.org/Education/Documents/isced-2011-en.pdf>
- van Damme, D.** (2001). Quality issues in the internationalisation of higher education. *Higher Education*, 41, 415–441.
- van Mol, C., & Timmerman, C.** (2013). Should I stay or should I go? An analysis of the determinants of intra-European student mobility. *Population, Space and Place*, 20, 465–479.
- Vincent-Lancrin, S.** (2008). The reversal of gender inequalities in higher education: An on-going trend. In OECD (Ed.), *Higher education to 2030. Volume 1: Demography* (pp. 265–298). Paris: OECD.
- Voyer, D., & Voyer, S. D.** (2014). Gender differences in scholastic achievement: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 140, 1174–1204.
- Wächter, B.** (2003). An introduction: Internationalisation at home in context. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 7, 5–11.
- Watts, C., & Pickering, A.** (2000). Pay as you learn: Student employment and academic progress. *Education and Training*, 42, 129–134.
- Whalen, K. E., Páez, A., & Carrasco, J. A.** (2013). Mode choice of university students commuting to school and the role of active travel. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 31, 132–142.
- Wiers-Jenssen, J.** (2011). Background and employability of mobile vs. non-mobile students. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 17, 79–100.
- Wolter, A.** (2004). From state control to competition: German higher education transformed. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 34, 73–104.
- Wuttig, S., Wächter, B., Rohde, N., Lam, Q., Lungu, I., & Rumbley, L.** (2011). *The Bologna process: Stocktaking and prospects*. Brussels: European Parliament.
- Yorke, M.** (2006). *Employability in higher education: what it is – what it is not*. York: Higher Education Academy.
- Zgaga, P.** (2008). Mobility and the European dimension in teacher education. In B. Hudson, & P. Zgaga (Eds.), *Teacher education policy in Europe: A voice of higher education institutions* (pp. 17–42). Umea: University of Umea.
- Zimmermann, J., & Neyer, F. J.** (2013). Do we become a different person when hitting the road? Personality development of sojourners. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 105, 515–530.

## Appendix A

### National contributors

#### Armenia (AM)

- Project sponsor: Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Armenia
- Implementation: Group of researchers – Lusine Fljyan, Nikolay Israyelyan, Hasmik Apyan (Yerevan Brusov State University of Languages and Social Sciences), Marina Galstyan, Arman Melkonyan (CERC), Heghine Manasyan, Monika Shahmenendyan, Artak Martirosyan (CRRC-Armenia), Karine Kostanyan, Narine Yardumyan (Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Armenia)
- Contact person: Lusine Fljyan – National Team Leader of EUROSTUDENT V (Yerevan Brusov State University of Languages and Social Sciences)
- Research team: Marina Galstyan, Arman Melkonyan (CERC), Heghine Manasyan, Monika Shahmenendyan (CRRC-Armenia), Artak Martirosyan, Lusine Fljyan
- National report: <http://www.edu.am/index.php?menu1=217&menu2=229&arch=0>

#### Austria (AT)

- Project sponsor: Federal Ministry of Science, Research and Economy (BMFWF)
- Implementation: Institute for Advanced Studies (IHS)
- Contact person: Martin Unger (IHS)
- Research team: Martin Unger (IHS), Jakob Hartl (IHS), Petra Wejwar (IHS)
- National report: [www.sozialerhebung.at](http://www.sozialerhebung.at)

#### Bosnia and Herzegovina (BA)

- Project sponsor: European Commission Tempus programme | FINHED Tempus Project
- Implementation: Centre for Education Policy (CEP), Federal Ministry of Education and Science of Bosnia and Herzegovina (FMON), Citizens' Association Nešto Više
- Contact person: Ivana Živadinović (CEP)
- Research team: Zlatan Buljko (FMON), Ivana Živadinović (CEP)
- National report: [www.finhed.org](http://www.finhed.org)

#### Croatia (HR)

- Project sponsor: Ministry of Science, Education and Sports
- Implementation: Ministry of Science, Education and Sports, Institute for the Development of Education, IPSOS, University Computing Centre, Eurydice HR
- Contact person: Tomislav Vodička
- Research team: Mirna Cvitan, Teo Matković, Karin Doolan, Matija Sinković, Thomas Farnell, Ninoslav Šćukanec, Tomislav Vodička
- National report: [www.eurostudent.hr](http://www.eurostudent.hr)

**Czech Republic (CZ)**

Project sponsor: Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports (MSMT)  
 Implementation: Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports (MSMT)  
 Contact person: Jakub Fischer (MSMT)  
 Research team: Jakub Fischer (MSMT), Kristyna Vltavska (MSMT)  
 National report: <http://kredo.reformy-msmt.cz/podminky-studentu-vs-soubor>

**Denmark (DK)**

Project sponsor: Ministry of Higher Education and Science  
 Implementation: Epinion in cooperation with the ministry  
 Contact person: Ken Thomassen (Ministry of Higher Education and Science)  
 Research team: Ken Thomassen (Ministry of Higher Education and Science)  
 National report: [www.ufm.dk](http://www.ufm.dk)

**Estonia (EE)**

Project sponsor: Archimedes Foundation, Program Primus  
 Implementation: University of Tartu, European College, Centre for Applied Social Sciences  
 Contact person: Kadrin Kergand (Archimedes Foundation)  
 Research team: Kerly Espenberg (CASS, project leader), Mai Beilmann (CASS, researcher), Marek Sammül (CASS, researcher), Sille Vahaste (CASS, researcher), Uku Varblane (CASS, researcher), Kadri Lees (CASS, researcher), Oliver Nahkur (CASS, researcher), Anne Aidla (Faculty of Economics and Business Administration, expert), Raul Eamets (Faculty of Economics and Business Administration, expert)  
 National report: [http://primus.archimedes.ee/sites/default/files/EurostudentV\\_l6pparuanne.pdf](http://primus.archimedes.ee/sites/default/files/EurostudentV_l6pparuanne.pdf)

**Finland (FI)**

Project sponsor: Ministry of Education and Culture  
 Implementation: Statistics Finland  
 Contact person: Vesa Virtanen (Statistics Finland)  
 Research team: Vesa Virtanen (Statistics Finland), Anna-Kaarina Potila (Statistics Finland)  
 National report: <http://www.minedu.fi/export/sites/default/OPM/Julkaisut/2014/liitteet/okm10.pdf?lang=fi>

**France (FR)**

Project sponsor: Centre National des Œuvres universitaires et scolaires (CNOUS)  
 Implementation: Observatoire national de la vie étudiante (OVE)  
 Contact person: Carole Waldvogel (OVE)  
 Research team: Odile Ferry (OVE)  
 National report: <http://www.ove-national.education.fr/>

**Georgia (GE)**

Project sponsor: Ministry of Education and Science of Georgia  
 Implementation: IPM Research, Ministry of Education and Science of Georgia  
 Contact person: Mzia Tsereteli  
 Research team: Mako Mchedlishvili – Researcher, Alexandre Siprashvili – Statistics specialist/data manager ( IPM Research)  
 National report: –

**Germany (DE)**

Project sponsor: Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF)  
 Implementation: Deutsches Zentrum für Hochschul- und Wissenschaftsforschung (German Centre for Research on Higher Education and Science Studies, DZHW)  
 Contact person: Elke Middendorff (DZHW)  
 Research team: Elke Middendorff (DZHW), Nicolai Netz (DZHW), Maren Kandulla (DZHW), Beate ApolinarSKI (DZHW), Jonas Poskowsky (DZHW)  
 National report: [www.sozialerhebung.de](http://www.sozialerhebung.de)

**Hungary (HU)**

Project sponsor: Ministry of Human Resources  
 Implementation: Educatio Public Services Non-profit Llc.  
 Contact person: László Kiss (Educatio Public Services Non-profit Llc.)  
 Research team: László Kiss (Educatio Public Services Non-profit Llc.), Orsolya Garai (Educatio Public Services Non-profit Llc.), Zsuzsanna Veroszta (Educatio Public Services Non-profit Llc.), Szilvia Nyüsti (Educatio Public Services Non-profit Llc.)  
 National report: [http://www.felvi.hu/felsooktatasimuhely/EUROSTUDENT/eurostudent\\_V\\_magyarorszagi\\_eredmenyei](http://www.felvi.hu/felsooktatasimuhely/EUROSTUDENT/eurostudent_V_magyarorszagi_eredmenyei)

**Ireland (IE)**

Project sponsor: Higher Education Authority (HEA)  
 Implementation: Insight Statistical Consulting (INSIGHT)  
 Contact person: Vivienne Patterson (HEA)  
 Research team: David Harmon (INSIGHT), Olivier Foubert (INSIGHT)  
 National report: [http://www.heai.ie/sites/default/files/eurostudentv\\_final.pdf](http://www.heai.ie/sites/default/files/eurostudentv_final.pdf)

**Italy (IT)**

Project sponsor: Ministry of Education, Universities and Research (MIUR)  
 Implementation: Fondazione Rui (with the support of the Università per stranieri di Perugia)  
 Contact person: Giovanni Finocchietti (Fondazione Rui), Daniele Livon (MIUR), Marzia Foroni (MIUR)  
 Research team: Giovanni Finocchietti, Maria Annunziata Pannone, Judit Jasso, Andrea Lombardinilo, Domenico Lovecchio, Alessandro Melchionna (MIUR)  
 National report: <http://www.eurostudent.it>

**Latvia (LV)**

Project sponsor: Ministry of Education and Science (IZM)  
 Implementation: Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, University of Latvia (LU FSI)  
 Contact person: Marina Mekša (IZM), Reinis Lasmanis (IZM)  
 Research team: Aleksandrs Aleksandrovš (LU FSI), Ilze Koroļeva (LU FSI), Ilze Trapenciē (LU FSI)  
 National report: <http://izm.izm.gov.lv/nozares-politika/izglitiba/augstaka-izglitiba/7238.html>

**Lithuania (LT)**

Project sponsor: Ministry of Education and Science (SMM)  
 Implementation: Research and Higher Education Monitoring and Analysis Centre (MOSTA)  
 Contact person: Kristina Masevičiūtė (MOSTA), Vaida Šaukeckienė (MOSTA)  
 Research team: Rolandas Jakštys (MOSTA), Kristina Masevičiūtė (MOSTA), Vaida Šaukeckienė (MOSTA)  
 National report: [http://www.mosta.lt/images/leidiniai/Eurostudent\\_5\\_tyrimo\\_Lietuvoje\\_rezultatai.pdf](http://www.mosta.lt/images/leidiniai/Eurostudent_5_tyrimo_Lietuvoje_rezultatai.pdf)

**Malta (MT)**

Project sponsor: National Commission for Further and Higher Education (NCFHE)  
 Implementation: National Commission for Further and Higher Education (NCFHE)  
 Contact person: Christine Scholz (NCFHE)  
 Research team: Christine Scholz (NCFHE)  
 National report: <http://www.ncfhe.org.mt/content/home-downloads-eurostudent/50659330/>

**Montenegro (ME)**

Project sponsor: European Commission Tempus programme | FINHED Tempus Project  
 Implementation: Centre for Education Policy (CEP), Ministry of Education, Montenegro  
 Contact person: Ivana Živadinović (CEP)  
 Research team: Biljana Mišović (Ministry of Education, Montenegro), Ivana Živadinović (CEP)  
 National report: [www.finhed.org](http://www.finhed.org)

**Norway (NO)**

Project sponsor: Ministry of Education and Research (KD)  
 Implementation: Statistics Norway (SSB)  
 Contact person: Kurt Jonny Einarsen (SSB)  
 Research team: Kurt Jonny Einarsen (SSB)  
 National report: –

**Poland (PL)**

Project sponsor: Ministry of Science and Higher Education  
 Implementation: WYG PSDB and SW Research  
 Contact person: Andrzej Stolarczyk (Ministry of Science and Higher Education)  
 Research team: Barbara Leszczynska, Natalia Jaworska, Piotr Zimolzak  
 National report: –

**Portugal (PT)**

Project sponsor: Ministry of Education and Science  
 Implementation: Direção-Geral do Ensino Superior (DGES)  
 Contact person: Bruno Caixeiro (DGES), Maria Frazão (DGES)  
 Research team: Maria Frazão (DGES)  
 National report: –

**Romania (RO)**

Project sponsor: Ministry of Education and Research  
 Implementation: Executive Agency for Higher Education, Research, Development and Innovation Funding (UEFISCDI) and Institute of Educational Sciences (ISE)  
 Contact person: Gabriela Jitaru (UEFISCDI)  
 Research team: Sorin Mitulescu, Bogdan Florian (ISE) and Gabriela Jitaru (UEFISCDI)  
 National report: <http://eurostudent.uefiscdi.ro/> and [www.ise.ro](http://www.ise.ro)

**Russia (RU)**

Project sponsor: –  
 Implementation: Peoples` Friendship University of Russia, Sociology Department (Head of department Prof. N. Narbut)  
 Contact person: Prof. Z. Puzanova  
 Research team: Prof. N. Narbut, Prof. Z. Puzanova, Assistant T. Larina, Assistant A. Tertyshnikova  
 National report: –

**Serbia (RS)**

Project sponsor: European Commission Tempus programme | FINHED Tempus Project  
 Implementation: University of Novi Sad (UNS), Centre for Education Policy (CEP)  
 Contact person: Mirko Savić (UNS)  
 Research team: Mirko Savić (UNS), Milena Kresoja (UNS), Ivana Živadinović (CEP), Zoran Lužanin (Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development)  
 National report: [www.finhed.org](http://www.finhed.org)

**Slovakia (SK)**

Project sponsor: Ministry of Education, Science, Research and Sport (MŠVVaŠ)  
 Implementation: Slovak Centre of Scientific and Technical Information (CVTI SR)  
 Contact person: Maria Sulanova (CVTI SR)  
 Research team: František Blanár (CVTI SR), Maria Sulanova (CVTI SR)  
 National report: –

**Slovenia (SI)**

Project sponsor: Ministry of Education, Science and Sport  
 Implementation: Ministry of Education, Science and Sport, Slovenian Student Union  
 Contact person: Uršula Konečnik (Ministry of Education, Science and Sport)  
 Research team: Uršula Konečnik (Ministry of Education, Science and Sport), Jelena Štrbac Nemec (Slovenian Student Union), Alen Črevar (Slovenian Student Union)  
 National report: <http://www.eurostudent-2013.si>

**Sweden (SE)**

Project sponsor: Ministry of Education and Research  
 Implementation: Swedish Council for Higher Education (UHR)  
 Contact person: Erica Finnerman (UHR)  
 Research team: Erica Finnerman (UHR), Fredrik Lindstrom (UHR)  
 National report: [www.uhr.se](http://www.uhr.se)

**Switzerland (CH)**

Project sponsor: State Secretariat for Education, Research and Innovation (SERI)  
 Implementation: Federal Statistical Office Switzerland (FSO)  
 Contact person: Sarah Gerhard Ortega (FSO)  
 Research team: Sarah Gerhard Ortega (FSO), Frank Schubert (FSO), Philipp Fischer (FSO)  
 National report: [www.students-stat.admin.ch](http://www.students-stat.admin.ch)

**The Netherlands (NL)**

Project sponsor: Ministry of Education, Culture and Science (MinOCW)  
 Implementation: ResearchNed  
 Contact person: Froukje Wartenbergh-Cras (ResearchNed), Bas Kurver (ResearchNed)  
 Research team: Froukje Wartenbergh-Cras (ResearchNed), Bas Kurver (ResearchNed)  
 National report: <http://www.studentenmonitor.nl>

**Ukraine (UA)**

Project sponsor: –  
 Implementation: V.N.Karazin Kharkov National University  
 Contact person: Kseniya Kizilova  
 Research team: Kseniya Kizilova  
 National report: –



## Appendix B

# Metadata on national surveys

Metadata are also available in the National Profiles and on the EUROSTUDENT website.

Country	Final sample size (unweighted, cleaned)	Return rate	Sampling method	Reference period	Survey method	Weighting scheme
AM	2,431	–	Proportional to student population size by study qualification	May 2014	Online survey	By sex, age and study qualification, according to instructions provided by E:\V
AT	41,651	approx. 20 %	Full survey	Summer term 2011	Online survey	By sex, age, HEI, study programme, domestic / international students
BA	3,594	approx. 5 %	Stratified combined with quota	Summer term 2014	Paper and pencil	By sex, age, level of study, HEI, type of HEI, student status, subject
CH	–	70 %	Random sample stratified by higher education institution and field of studies	Spring 2013	Online survey	By sex, age group, programme and national origin
CZ	4,664	7 %	Probability	Summer semester 2013	Online survey	By age, school
DE	14,235	28 % (net return rate)	Simple random sample (for details see Middendorff et al., 2013, pp. 41-52)	June–August 2012	Paper and pencil	Poststratification weights based on federal state, type of institution, subject area and sex
DK	6,733	21 %	Stratified sample (by age, gender, type of institution, nationality)	Spring 2013	Online survey	By age, sex, type of institution and nationality
EE	5,989	9.7 %	None, every student in Estonia received an invitation to participate	Spring semester 2013 (sample size from May 1 <sup>st</sup> , 2013)	Online survey	By HEI, sex, age, and level of education
FI	3,620	33 % (weighted)	Proportionate stratified random sampling	March 25 <sup>th</sup> –May 16 <sup>th</sup> 2013	Online survey	By age, sex, HEI, field of education (CALMAR)
FR	36,045	22 %	Stratified random sampling (by HEI size)	March–June 2013	Online survey	By sex, age, type of HEI, type of degree
GE	2,501	–	Stratified random sampling	2 <sup>nd</sup> semester 2014	Online survey, paper and pencil	By gender, HEI, programme, qualification
HR	2,551	2 %	All students have been invited to participate	2013–2014	Online survey	By sex, age, study programme, formal status, university, education of parents according to data from winter semester 2012
HU	16,745	10 %	Institutional sample	1 <sup>st</sup> semester 2013	Online survey	By sex, age, study programme, type of HEI and field of study
IE	9,449	5.1 %	Census	April 22 <sup>nd</sup> –May 31 <sup>st</sup> 2013	Online survey, paper and pencil	–
IT	5,403	not applicable	Quota; by geographical area, field of study, programme, gender, and age	Academic year 2011–2012	CATI – Computer assisted telephone interview	By geographical area, field of study, programme, sex, age
LT	1,731	6 %	Stratified random sampling. Stratification was made according to HEIs, gender and study form (student formal status)	Summer semester, 2013 (April - May)	Online survey	By type of HEI, sex, age, study form (student formal status)
LV	2,037	80 %	Multiple stage stratified sampling	Academic year 2012/2013, second semester (April–June, 2013)	Paper and pencil	By sex, study program, thematic groups
ME	1,632	approx. 8 %	None – all students were contacted	Summer term 2014	Online survey	By sex, HEI, student status, level of study
MT	1,190	10.4 %	Total target population surveyed (11,487)	Summer semester 2013	Online survey	By higher education institution attended, sex, age and EQF level of the programme followed
NL	20,032	30.2 %	Studentpanel + stratified sample student administration	May 14 <sup>th</sup> –July 16 <sup>th</sup> 2013	Online survey	By type of HEI, field of study, year of study, sex, Bachelor/ Master
NO	3,425	44 %	Simple random sample of 8,000 students, no stratification was used	Spring 2013	Online survey, paper and pencil	By sex, age, region, institution type and citizenship



Country	Final sample size (unweighted, cleaned)	Return rate	Sampling method	Reference period	Survey method	Weighting scheme
PL	3,119	10.8 %	Random sample within quotas defined by region, type of HEI, field of study, sex	2 <sup>nd</sup> semester, 2014	Online survey	Population weights based on national statistics from 30 <sup>th</sup> Nov 2013, joint distribution of students' age, sex, type of HEI and formal status (full-time/part-time) was used to create the final survey weights.
RO	2,184	7 %	Stratified sample	2 <sup>nd</sup> semester 2013	Online survey	None
RS	3,780	approx. 84 %	Stratified combined with quota	Summer term 2014	Paper and pencil	By sex, age, status, year of study, field of study
RU	2,576	–	Quota method	April–May 2014	Paper and pencil, face-to-face (few cases)	–
SE	1,669	37.2 %	Random sampling	Spring 2013	Online survey	By sex, age, programme, HEI
SI	2,286	–	–	–	Online survey	–
SK	3,734	94 %	Stratified quota according proportion of full-time and part-time students, HEI, field of study, study location, year of study and sex	November–December 2012	Paper and pencil	By sex, age and HEI in division by field of study
UA	3,301	90 %	Multi-stage stratified sample, quotas and random selection	April–May 2014 (2 semester; 2013–2014 studying year)	Paper and pencil	No weighting

## Appendix C

### Key data on national student populations (weighted, in %)

Country/ Source	Sex		Age groups				Qualification			Type of Higher Education Institution (HEI)		Field of Study								
	female students	male students	younger than 22 years	at least 22 but younger than 25 years	at least 25 but younger than 30 years	at least 30 years	Bachelor students	Master students	other degree	university	non-university	education	humanities, arts	social sciences, business, law	(natural) science	engineering, manufacturing, construction	agriculture	health, welfare	services	missing
AM	73	27	78	18	3	2	78	22	0	94	6	9	31	24	6	12	3	9	2	3
AT	54	46	23	31	28	18	50	14	37	84	16	14	12	38	13	13	1	7	2	1
BA	58	42	39	42	16	3	80	12	8	98	2	10	10	31	8	15	5	15	6	0
CH	52	48	17	40	31	13	71	25	4	58	42	13	13	35	10	13	1	13	2	1
CZ	57	43	34	39	16	12	68	32	0	95	5	10	9	36	16	15	3	8	3	0
DE	48	52	25	40	27	8	62	13	25	65	35	15	10	27	13	21	2	10	1	2
DK	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
EE	59	41	25	32	24	19	72	21	8	76	24	9	11	29	12	15	2	11	9	1
FI	54	47	15	27	32	26	63	37	0	56	44	12	9	24	21	13	3	16	3	2
FR	54	47	63	23	9	5	42	22	36	72	29	3	18	35	16	15	1	8	0.1	4
GE	56	44	60	34	5	1	86	14	0	100	0	5	18	47	12	8	2	6	2	0
HR	56	44	47	32	14	7	64	21	16	79	21	4	8	34	20	16	3	10	4	0.4
HU	55	45	26	47	15	12	73	14	13	84	16	7	6	33	8	22	2	12	5	6
IE	63	37	49	19	12	20	16	10	68	61	39	7	22	24	25	9	2	9	3	0.1
IT	57	43	45	31	19	5	66	17	18	100	0	4	14	35	9	18	3	14	4	0
LT	58	42	52	27	11	10	85	14	1	70	30	7	10	40	7	18	3	12	3	2
LV	59	41	56	29	9	6	63	23	14	60	40	1	14	36	9	16	3	15	8	0
ME	55	45	35	38	15	11	85	15	0.3	100	0	3	10	30	11	18	4	5	20	0
MT	55	45	47	14	23	16	47	25	28	82	18	8	15	32	19	6	0.2	16	4	0
NL	53	48	44	31	14	11	82	15	4	37	63	10	7	50	3	15	3	11	0	1
NO	64	36	22	31	23	24	49	30	21	47	53	17	9	12	8	12	1	21	0.4	7
PL	59	41	42	39	13	6	61	26	13	56	44	0	11	45	11	22	3	8	0	0
RO <sup>1</sup>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
RS	51	49	41	39	14	7	80	16	4	88	12	4	12	43	5	20	4	9	3	0
RU <sup>1</sup>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SE	60	40	18	25	25	33	33	35	32	100	0	14	12	19	16	11	1	16	0.2	0.5
SI	58	42	27	53	9	11	71	12	18	85	15	4	13	33	15	14	7	11	<0.1	4
SK	58	42	50	32	9	8	69	26	5	100	0	11	10	34	9	16	3	13	5	1
UA <sup>1</sup>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

<sup>1</sup> data were not weighted

**Notes:** Rounded values are shown. Decimal points are only shown for values below 0.5.

Country/ Source	Educational attainment of parents			Transition into HE			Study intensity				Dependency on income source				Origin of leaving school system first time		
	without HE background (ISCED 0–4)	with HE background (ISCED 5–8)	missing	direct transition students	delayed transition students	missing	low-intensity students	medium-intensity students	high-intensity students	missing	depend. family support	depend. own earnings	depend. public support	missing	national students	international students	missing
AM	4	89	7	81	6	13	2	21	70	8	84	1	0	16	94	5	1
AT	65	33	2	66	16	18	24	45	24	8	32	23	6	26	82	18	<0.1
BA	51	48	1	66	5	29	11	23	15	51	58	3	1	35	86	5	9
CH	40	56	5	77	9	15	15	51	31	3	47	31	3	10	86	14	0
CZ	52	48	0	87	11	2	39	48	13	0.1	51	23	0.1	5	93	7	0.1
DE	49	49	2	87	12	1	14	50	33	4	51	19	16	2	99	0.3	0.4
DK	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
EE	32	40	28	72	15	13	18	30	17	35	28	32	7	3	93	3	4
FI	40	45	28	45	29	11	17	39	27	25	18	33	14	37	87	12	0.5
FR	42	57	2	95	2	3	21	43	33	3	38	12	16	34	98	2	<0.1
GE	26	73	0	96	4	0	20	58	20	0	76	10	0	0	100	0.1	0
HR	53	46	1	90	7	3	14	39	30	17	65	6	5	17	97	3	0
HU	51	49	0.1	72	14	14	17	34	27	22	47	18	8	10	92	2	5
IE	44	49	7	78	10	12	12	50	33	4	50	16	11	23	91	9	0.3
IT	71	27	2	94	6	0.1	18	–	42	3	15	5	1	80	100	0	0
LT	34	61	5	92	8	1	20	44	26	10	49	26	4	7	99	1	0
LV	34	64	0	88	12	1	20	52	25	3	48	31	5	1	99	1	0.1
ME	45	54	1	68	9	23	20	29	13	37	52	15	2	26	91	5	4
MT	37	14	48	86	2	12	10	20	22	48	22	22	13	44	76	2	22
NL	46	49	5	79	9	12	22	47	21	10	18	19	8	55	93	7	0
NO	32	61	7	45	52	3	28	48	24	0.1	5	31	55	7	98	2	0
PL	51	45	0	100	0	0	–	–	–	–	26	50	21	0	98	2	0
RO <sup>1</sup>	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
RS	55	44	0.2	89	7	4	–	–	–	–	79	4	1	13	91	9	0
RU <sup>1</sup>	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
SE	40	58	3	46	37	17	23	34	26	17	13	29	33	8	84	15	1
SI	43	54	2	91	3	6	16	41	38	5	41	23	9	8	14	0	87
SK	59	39	2	82	14	4	21	55	21	4	48	20	4	8	97	0.4	2
UA <sup>1</sup>	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

<sup>1</sup> data were not weighted

**Notes:** Rounded values are shown. Decimal points are only shown for values below 0.5.

## Appendix D

### Raw data on national samples (unweighted, in %)

Country/ Source	Students in Sample	Sex		Age groups				Qualification			Type of Higher Education Institution (HEI)		Field of Study									
		female students	male students	younger than 22 years	at least 22 but younger than 25 years	at least 25 but younger than 30 years	at least 30 years	Bachelor students	Master students	other degree	university	non-university	education	humanities, arts	social sciences, business, law	(natural) science	engineering, manu- facturing, construction	agriculture	health, welfare	services	missing	
AM	2,431	55	45	74	17	4	4	83	12	6	94	6	8	27	24	6	15	3	10	3	4	
AT	41,651	63	37	25	34	27	15	51	14	35	76	24	15	11	35	12	13	2	11	2	1	
BA	3,594	61	39	58	33	7	1	82	12	6	97	3	8	15	34	10	16	4	11	4	0	
CH <sup>1</sup>	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	
CZ	4,664	68	32	38	41	13	9	66	34	0	97	3	12	12	33	16	10	2	13	3	0	
DE	14,235	58	42	27	41	26	7	58	14	28	73	27	17	10	26	12	19	2	11	1	2	
DK	6,733	55	45	10	48	25	18	60	18	22	42	58	4	13	26	10	18	0	15	0	14	
EE	5,989	73	27	34	34	17	15	73	18	9	69	31	9	13	27	10	13	2	16	10	1	
FI	3,620	61	39	19	29	30	22	66	34	0	55	45	6	16	24	20	12	3	17	3	6	
FR	36,045	63	38	68	24	5	2	42	17	41	68	32	2	17	35	14	17	1	10	0.1	4	
GE	2,501	62	38	60	34	5	1	75	25	0	100	0	5	18	47	12	8	2	6	2	0	
HR	2,551	61	39	49	38	11	3	66	23	11	85	15	5	12	30	20	17	4	8	4	1	
HU	16,745	61	39	31	37	17	15	73	16	12	86	14	7	6	33	7	23	3	12	5	5	
IE	9,449	63	37	52	20	10	19	84	11	5	59	42	7	22	25	23	9	2	9	3	0.1	
IT	5,403	57	43	45	30	20	5	65	17	18	100	0	7	13	31	8	19	5	13	6	0	
LT	1,731	78	23	44	36	12	8	80	18	2	77	23	8	11	42	6	13	2	14	3	2	
LV	2,037	66	34	58	28	9	5	68	20	12	62	38	1	15	32	9	16	4	15	8	0	
ME	1,632	56	44	37	35	14	13	87	13	0.3	100	0	3	10	29	9	16	4	4	25	0	
MT	1,190	63	37	55	23	7	15	61	15	24	80	20	9	15	32	20	7	0.2	12	4	0	
NL	20,032	62	38	49	30	12	9	78	18	4	50	50	9	9	39	5	16	5	16	0	2	
NO	3,425	64	36	22	31	23	24	49	30	21	47	53	16	9	30	9	12	1	21	2	0.1	
PL	3,119	60	40	38	41	16	5	61	26	12	59	41	0	12	43	12	22	3	8	0	0	
RO <sup>2</sup>	2,184	60	42	52	33	8	7	82	18	0	100	0	2	9	28	8	29	8	12	6	0	
RS	3,780	63	37	55	34	8	4	78	14	8	82	18	12	19	23	6	23	5	10	2	0	
RU	2,576	65	35	64	31	4	1	93	7	0	91	9	2	15	39	12	10	1	12	7	1	
SE	1,669	64	36	16	26	27	31	56	39	6	100	0	14	11	21	15	10	1	18	0.3	10	
SI	2,286	73	27	39	43	14	4	69	18	13	89	11	5	15	33	16	11	8	10	<0.1	3	
SK	3,734	62	38	45	37	9	8	66	29	5	100	0	11	8	36	8	14	5	13	4	1	
UA	3,301	58	42	91	9	0.4	0.3	83	17	0	28	72	8	9	35	10	23	3	7	4	0	

1 No unweighted data published. 2 Total numbers for the categories "Sex", "Field of Study", "Educational attainment of parents", "Transition into HE" and "Dependency on income source" include PhD students.

**Notes:** Rounded values are shown. Decimal points are only shown for values below 0.5.

Country/ Source	Stu- dents in Sample	Educational attainment of parents			Transition into HE			Study intensity				Dependency on income source				Origin of leaving school system first time		
		without HE background (ISCED 0–4)	with HE background (ISCED 5–8)	missing	direct transition students	delayed transition students	missing	low-intensity students	medium-intensity students	high-intensity students	missing	depend. family support	depend. own earnings	depend. public support	missing	national students	international students	missing
AM	2,431	19	77	4	78	9	13	3	20	69	8	69	1	0	19	93	6	1
AT	41,651	68	30	2	72	17	12	21	45	26	8	34	22	6	26	88	12	< 0.1
BA	3,594	53	46	1	73	3	24	11	25	17	48	61	2	2	32	89	4	8
CH <sup>1</sup>	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
CZ	4,664	50	50	0	90	8	2	36	51	14	< 0.1	50	19	0.1	5	92	7	0.2
DE	14,235	48	50	2	88	12	1	13	50	34	3	53	17	16	2	99	0.3	0.4
DK	6,733	25	72	3	53	26	21	22	36	24	18	1	4	40	55	77	23	0
EE	5,989	33	39	28	75	13	12	16	31	18	35	31	28	7	3	93	3	5
FI	3,620	39	47	15	49	26	25	16	40	28	16	19	31	16	15	87	12	0.4
FR	36,045	41	58	1	97	1	2	20	42	35	3	40	10	16	17	98	2	< 0.1
GE	2,501	26	73	2	96	4	0.3	20	58	21	0.2	75	9	7	3	100	0.1	0
HR	2,551	55	45	1	93	4	3	13	41	32	14	72	4	1	8	97	3	0
HU	16,745	52	48	0.2	69	15	16	17	34	26	23	45	19	8	28	92	2	6
IE	9,449	45	48	7	80	10	10	12	51	33	4	53	16	11	16	92	8	0.3
IT	5,403	71	27	2	94	6	0.1	18	37	42	3	15	5	1	80	100	0	0
LT	1,731	34	62	3	93	7	0.3	20	44	26	9	52	24	5	20	99	1	0
LV	2,037	35	62	3	89	11	1	18	50	29	3	49	28	5	1	99	1	0.1
ME	1,632	45	54	1	67	12	21	22	32	15	31	54	18	2	20	90	6	3
MT	1,190	38	18	45	69	24	7	8	20	26	46	25	14	17	43	79	3	18
NL	20,032	43	53	4	80	8	12	20	48	23	9	20	16	9	55	93	7	0
NO	3,425	32	61	7	45	52	3	28	48	24	0.1	5	31	55	10	98	2	0
PL	3,119	49	48	4	98	0	2	26	48	23	4	41	30	6	16	98	2	0
RO <sup>2</sup>	2,184	40	26	36	74	27	0	9	31	24	37	22	9	12	58	100	0	0
RS	3,780	59	41	0.1	91	5	4	12	52	32	5	81	3	2	10	91	9	0
RU	2,576	31	68	2	87	7	6	7	35	53	5	68	6	1	3	94	6	0
SE	1,669	39	59	3	43	39	18	19	37	29	16	14	26	35	25	84	16	1
SI	2,286	43	54	2	93	1	6	16	42	38	5	42	20	12	7	10	0	90
SK	3,734	61	37	2	82	14	4	21	56	19	4	51	21	3	9	97	1	2
UA	3,301	33	63	4	93	6	1	13	44	43	0	38	14	6	0	99	1	0

<sup>1</sup> No unweighted data published. <sup>2</sup> Total numbers for the categories “Sex”, “Field of Study”, “Educational attainment of parents”, “Transition into HE” and “Dependency on income source” include PhD students.

**Notes:** Rounded values are shown. Decimal points are only shown for values below 0.5.